Lexical Archaisms in Slavic:
From Nostratic to Common Slavic

BPX 26

BOCHUM PUBLICATIONS IN EVOLUTIONARY CULTURAL SEMIOTICS

Aim and Scope: Interdisciplinary contributions to the analysis of sign-systems within the evolutionary framework of culture.

Modes of Publication: Irregular intervals, approximately 5 to 10 volumes per year. Monographs, collections of papers on topical issues, proceedings of colloquies etc.

General Editor: Walter A. Koch (Bochum).

Advisory Editors: Karl Eimermacher (Bochum), Achim Eschbach (Essen).

Advisory Board: Paul Bouissac (Toronto), Yoshihiko Ikegami (Tokyo), Vjačeslav Vs. Ivanov (Moscow), Rolf Kloepfer (Mannheim), You-Zheng Li (Beijing), Solomon Marcus (Bucharest), Roland Posner (Berlin), Thomas A. Sebeok (Bloomington), Vladimir N. Toporov (Moscow), Jan Wind (Amsterdam), Irene Portis Winner (Cambridge, Mass.), Thomas G. Winner (Cambridge, Mass.).

Editorial Staff: Claudia Putz, Cornelia Sholl (all Bochum).

Editorial Address: Englisches Seminar
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Postfach 102148
D-4630 Bochum 1
Fed. Rep. Germany
Tel. (0234) 700-2590 or 2519

Orders for individual volumes or the entire series should be directed to:
Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer
Querenburger Höhe 239
D-4630 Bochum-Querenburg
Fed. Rep. Germany
Tel. (0234) 701360 or 701383

A list of **available and planned volumes** of the series is printed towards the end of this volume.

LEXICAL ARCHAISMS IN SLAVIC: FROM NOSTRATIC TO COMMON SLAVIC

With a Preface by Vitaly Shevoroshkin

by

Mark Kaiser

BPX 26

Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer • Bochum •
1990

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

CIP-Titelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Kaiser, Mark:
Lexical archaisms in slavic : from nostratic to common slavic / by Mark Kaiser. With a preface by Vitaly Shevoroshkin. – Bochum : Brockmeyer, 1990
(Bochum publications in evolutionary cultural semiotics ; 26)
ISBN 3-88339-790-3

NE: GT

HZA 9439-26

Univ Bibliothek Bochum

90/5159

© 1990 by Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer

Printed in Germany by Druck Thiebes GmbH & Co. KG, Hagen.

ISBN 3-88339-790-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. All rights reserved.

BPX

Bochum Publications in Evolutionary Cultural Semiotics

EDITORIAL

BPX is a series of monographs or collections of papers (also resulting from pertinent colloquia) that are published at irregular intervals. The series is designed to bring into focus the interaction of nature and culture. Particular emphasis will be given to the overall ideas of **integration** and **focus**. Communicative processes will be considered to be integrated parts of cosmogenesis, biogenesis, psychogenesis etc. The fundamental processes underlying all levels of evolution are assumed to be identical. Not unlike most other sciences, **evolutionary semiotics** is considered to share in an ultimately unitary and indivisible reality. Its specificity is derived solely from its focus on a particular level of evolution: although seemingly obvious, the exact nature of this inevitable bias (human or proto-human predicament) continues to deserve concentrated attention. The prototypical structure for this is considered to be **culture**: a phenomenon whose true integrative potentialities have not yet been fully discovered or explored. For a semiotics thus conceived, structure and process are not different phases of reality and/or sciences but rather mere faces of a unitary field. In the view of this series, then, any fruitful attempt at semiotic analysis will be based on premises of macro-integration - or **evolution** - and of micro-integration - or **culture.**

While it is the ambitious goal of this series to encourage interdisciplinary work on the nature of culture as outlined above, BPX will have to be content - especially in its initial stages - with more modest attempts at elucidating semiogenesis. In addition, most contributions will presumably be relatively specific, covering all possible areas of culture or proto-culture, with the desired unity or homogeneity - regarding aim and scope - largely confined to the background.

Bochum, December 1984

W. A. K.

Lyuba & Miriam & Esther

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE (by Vitaly Shevoroshkin) v

INTRODUCTION 1

Endnotes to Introduction 4

CHAPTER

I. THE HISTORY OF DISTANT COMPARISON 5

Distant Comparison Prior to 1964 6
Indo-European and Uralic
Uralic and Altaic
Dravidian and Uralic/Altaic
Indo-European and Kartvelian
Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic
The Nostratic Theory 10
The Theoretical Foundation
The Reconstruction of Nostratic
Reviews of the Nostratic Dictionary
Recent Work in Deep Reconstruction 22
Recent Refinements in Nostratic Theory
The Contributions of Bomhard
Reconstruction of Other Macro-Families
Endnotes to Chapter I 33

II. SLAVIC REFLEXES OF NOSTRATIC ROOTS 34

Slavic Lexical Data from the Dictionary . 35
Slavic Lexical Data from the "Materialy" . 91
Slavic Lexical Data with Questionable
IE Cognates 118
Endnotes to Chapter II 121

III. ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONCLUSIONS . . 122

APPENDIX 128

BIBLIOGRAPHY 130

PREFACE

One quarter century ago Vladislav Illič-Svityč and Aharon Dolgopolsky began publishing their independent work on the reconstruction of the Nostratic proto-language. Since that time the Nostratic Theory has been supported by many outstanding scholars, including Collinder, Ivanov, Poppe, Menges, and Anttila. Subsequent research has supported many of Illič-Svityč's proposals, including the reconstruction of an Altaic family, the division of Nostratic into East and West branches, and the positing of the Indo-European homeland in Anatolia. It has also engendered a new field of linguistic research: the deep reconstruction of distant linguistic relations. Soviet scholars have succeeded in reconstructing Proto-North-Caucasian, which, together with Sino-Tibetan and Yenissean (and several American Indian language groups), form the Sino-Caucasian macrofamily.

For several years I have stressed the significant role that Nostratic data can play in our interpretations of Indo-European and subsequent developments in the daughter languages. Therefore, it is with satisfaction that I read Kaiser's study of Nostratic reflexes in the Slavic languages.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the study is

the extent to which Slavic is shown to retain lexical archaisms. Vjacheslav Ivanov in his review of the first volume of Illič-Svityč's Dictionary noted one example where Nostratic can be used to show the retention of archaisms in Slavic, namely, *bьrǫ 'take' (> 'take away' > 'carry' in the remaining Indo-European languages, but 'take' is retained in all other Nostratic groups; see Illič-Svityč 1971:176-7). Kaiser points out a number of other examples where Illič-Svityč's analysis is superior to the traditional interpretations of Pokorny, Vasmer, and most recently, those of Trubačev. For example, Trubačev attempts to link Slavic *bolěti 'be ill', *bolь 'pain' with *bolьjь 'greater' (< IE *bel- 'strong'), whereas Nostratic data support the reconstruction of an original meaning of 'wound, pain'. Similarly, Trubačev derives the Slavic form *golъ 'bare' from IE *ghel- 'shine', but without any substantiation. However, once again Slavic is shown to retain archaic features in Slovenian gol 'young tree trunk stripped of branches' and Old Russian golь 'branch' (< IE *gol- 'bare, bald' < Nostratic **kal'ʌ 'strip bark, skin', see Illič-Svityč 1971:289-90). Many other examples are listed in Chapter Three.

I am hopeful that this monograph will prove to be the first in a series tracing the development of roots from Nostratic to their reflexes in the daughter languages.

Vitaly Shevoroshkin
Ann Arbor

INTRODUCTION

A number of controversial new theories and pioneering research in new areas have made historical linguistics an exciting field for investigation during the past several years. Examples of the ongoing revitalization of Indo-European [IE] studies are the laryngeal theory, glottalic theory, questions of ergativity, progress in the reconstruction of the Indo-European accentual system, as well as debates over the original homeland and the differentiation of borrowing from common genetic origin.[1]

Of all the recent developments in historical linguistics, perhaps the one with the greatest potential significance for our understanding of linguistic prehistory is the most recent attempt to link IE genetically with other language families and to reconstruct their proto-, or in Henrik Birnbaum's terminology, their preproto-language.

This protolanguage, the mother tongue of IE, has been designated Nostratic. It should be noted, however, that there exist a number of versions of the Nostratic Theory, which show significant differences in methodology and the objects being compared. The most ambitious and by far the most successful of these reconstructions began appearing in the early 1960's in Moscow.

The reconstruction of a pre-IE language must influence our interpretation of IE, even if only to lend greater credence to one etymology than to another. Similarly, a change in our understanding of IE inevitably would lead to a reevaluation of the material in the various daughter languages, including Slavic.

The intent of this work is neither to prove nor disprove the merits of the Nostratic Theory. Rather, my purpose is to reexamine those Common Slavic lexemes which Illič-Svityč, the author of the Nostratic Dictionary, claims to have traced from Nostratic and to compare his etymologies with what we might call the accepted standards, i.e., the etymologies of Pokorny for IE and those of Vasmer for Russian (and, mutatis mutandi, for Slavic in general). Moreover, the ongoing reconstruction of Common Slavic[2] provides us with the opportunity to compare Illič-Svityč's reconstructions with the research done during the years since his death in 1966. In most cases we will find that Illič-Svityč made no changes in the accepted etymology. However, in a number of instances, Illič-Svityč's analysis of IE and Slavic data is significantly different from both the traditional interpretation by Pokorny and Vasmer and the later solutions of Trubačev, and in several instances he anticipates Trubačev.[3] Therefore, conclusions regarding the superiority or inferiority of Illič-Svityč's work vis-á-vis the more traditional approach and the most recent research are inevitable.

For my analysis of the Nostratic theory I have relied primarily on Illič-Svityč's Dictionary [Illič-Svityč 1971, 1976, 1984]. However, the Dictionary is complete only to words in P, which necessitated the use of data found in his earlier, less sophisticated work [Illič-Svityč 1967]. A discussion of the development of the Nostratic Theory and the source materials used for this paper are provided in Chapter I.

In Chapter II I present the data and a commentary to them, when needed. The absence of a commentary indicates there are no substantive differences between Illič-Svityč's interpretation and that of Pokorny, Trubačev, and Vasmer.

In Chapter III a brief analysis of the distribution of data and some conclusions are provided.

Endnotes to Introduction

1. Szemerényi 1985 provides a good discussion of recent developments in IE studies from a traditional point of view.

2. Trubačev 1974- has published 15 volumes to date covering Common Slavic lexemes a-lokačь.

3. Trubačev has made no use of Illič-Svityč's Nostratic work, but on occasion refers to his work on Slavic accentuation.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORY OF DISTANT COMPARISON

The development of the comparative method in historical linguistics was one of the great intellectual achievements of the nineteenth century. The demonstration of a regular correspondence of sound and meaning between two or more languages made it possible to reconstruct the great language families: Indo-European, Uralic, Hamito-Semitic (=Afro-Asiatic [AA]), etc. In the nineteenth century some scholars envisaged wider or more remote relationships between languages, and these early efforts culminated in a number of binary comparisons of language families.

In 1964 two scholars in the USSR - Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč, a specialist in IE, Altaic, and Kartvelian, and Aaron B. Dolgopolsky, an Indo-Europeanist and Hamito-Semitist, independently published important articles extending the scope of these studies, using data from more than the pairs of language families hitherto studied. Rigorously applying the comparative method, they produced convincing evidence for a remote relationship between six major language families: IE, Afro-Asiatic [AA], Kartvelian [Kart.], Uralic, Altaic, and Dravidian [Drav.]. Together they constitute a macro-family known as Nostratic, from the term first suggested in Pedersen 1924.[1] This is the research which I now propose to review in greater detail.

Distant Comparison Prior To 1964

Although comparative-historical linguistics was first developed in the nineteenth century, the seeds of this development had been sown towards the end of the previous century in several acute observations, for example, in Sir William Jones' insight concerning the kinship of Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit or in Gyarmathi's demonstration of the relationship of Hungarian and Finnish.

But it was not until the nineteenth century that a rigorous method was worded out for the demonstration of relationships between languages on the basis of regular correspondences of sound and meaning. As a result of this, many of the well-known language families were established, including Indo-European, Uralic, Hamito-Semitic, Dravidian, Austronesian and others.

Early in the nineteenth century some of the pioneers in the field, including Rasmus Rask and Franz Bopp, hinted at the possibility of a wider relationship, and in the latter half of the century more detailed and explicit groupings of language-families were made. As early as 1875 the founder of Dravidian studies, Robert Caldwell, pointed to a relationship between Dravidian and Ural-Altaic on the one hand, and a possible, even more remote relationship to Indo-European and Semitic on the other. This in a remarkable way anticipated the modern grouping of Nostratic languages into Eastern (Dravidian, Uralic, Altaic) and Western (AA, IE, Kartvelian) subgroups.

Nearly all of the studies of remote relationships which appeared in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries confined themselves to relationships between pairs of language families.[2] Binary comparisons are inherently defective: they lack a language which would act as a control and as a result are prone to speculation. If we were to reconstruct IE on the basis of only two of the language groups (e.g., Germanic and Greek), our reconstruction would differ significantly from what we now posit for IE. Nevertheless, the early binary comparisons were important in establishing the merit of comparing what had initially appeared as unrelated language families. A brief survey of some of the early binary comparisons is provided below.

Indo-European and Uralic

One of the earliest suggestions of a relationship between IE and Uralic was made in Cuno 1871, and Köppen 1890 studied the original homeland of the Indo-Europeans and Finno-Ugrians. A number of lexical parallels were pointed out in Wiklund 1906, Paasonen 1907, and Sköld 1927, but no sound correspondences were established. The work by Collinder 1934 on morphological and lexical correspondences was much more convincing, and in Collinder 1965 we begin to see the establishment of exact phonetic correspondences between these language families; most of these correspondences were corroborated by the work of Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky. Collinder 1965 compared about two dozen words from Uralic languages with those from

IE, but no attempt at reconstruction was made.

Collinder 1957:138ff noted that in many cases these Uralic-IE parallels have correspondences in other languages, thus anticipating the work of Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky. For instance, in Yukagir, Turkic and Tungus he found correspondences for Finnish käly 'sister-in-law'~ PIE *ǵḷōu- and in Tungus for Finnish palkää- 'be afraid'~ PIE *pel-.

<u>Uralic and Altaic</u>

As early as 1862 Castrén proposed a relationship between Uralic and Altaic personal affixes. In Sauvageot 1930 an attempt was made to establish phonetic correspondences between Uralic and Altaic. More successful results were obtained in Németh 1928-30 and Sinor 1944 and 1952, although these were limited to Uralic-Turkic comparisons. Broader Uralic-Altaic correspondences were developed in Räsänen 1947, 1955, 1963-65, and important grammatical and lexical parallels were shown by K. Menges (1960, 1963-64).

<u>Dravidian and Uralic/Altaic</u>

Following Caldwell's original suggestion of 1875 a number of scholars, including Schrader 1924 and 1935-7, Burrow 1946, Tuttle 1930, and Bouda 1956 proposed morphological and lexical correspondences between Uralic and Dravidian. Much of this work was inaccurate. However, several satisfactory correspondences were proposed in Andronov 1965.

The possibility of a genetic relationship between Dravidian and Altaic served as the subject of Hulbert 1906 and Bouda 1956. However, much of their work is now seen as inaccurate. Menges 1964 proposed a number of interesting morphological and lexical comparisons.

<u>Indo-European and Kartvelian</u>

Earlier Bopp had suggested a comparison of Indo-European with Kartvelian (South Caucasian). Some parallels were noted in the works of Vogt 1938, Polàk 1955, Klimov 1964, Melikišvili 1965. These were mostly explained as borrowings, but many are more probably evidence of remote genetic relationship.

<u>Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic</u>

All of the work done in this field prior to the efforts of Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky was limited to comparisons between IE and Semitic. The works of Möller 1907, 1911 and Cuny 1924, 1934, 1943, 1946 were the most successful.

Möller's and Cuny's comparisons of IE and Semitic were probably the best known of all the attempts at distant linguistic comparison in the early twentieth century. However, their thesis of a genetic relationship between IE and Semitic failed to gain support from Indo-Europeanists, and their application of the comparative method came under attack [Meriggi 1927 and Heilmann 1949]. In particular, the number of correspondences in IE for any one Semitic phoneme, and vice versa, was so great as to make it pos-

sible to compare nearly any two lexemes with similar meaning.[3]

* * *

Few linguists were ready to accept the thesis of remote genetic relationships. Since the 1930's synchronic linguistics has dominated the field, and deep historical reconstruction has been considered dubious, at best. Even mainstream Indo-Europeanists treated deep reconstruction sceptically, largely because Indo-European studies are extremely rigorous and relatively better developed, but also as a result of the highly speculative nature of <u>binary</u> comparisons.

However, at the same time Indo-European has been subject to a number of reinterpretations, many of which are neither provable nor disprovable based on internal evidence. A number of examples come to mind: ergativity to explain syntactical differences in the daughter languages, the reconstruction of anywhere from two to six and more IE laryngeals, and most recently the hypothesis of a glottalized series of IE stops, the proof of which rests entirely on typological considerations. There has been an urgent need for some type of mechanism to control our speculations about IE.

The Nostratic Theory

Against this background in 1964 V. M. Illič-Svityč and A. B. Dolgopolsky began to publish the results

of their independent research on the genetic affinity of a wide group of languages of Eurasia, to which Illič-Svityč gave the name "Nostratic." At the time of his premature death in 1966, Illič-Svityč had compiled most of the Nostratic Dictionary, the first volume of which was published posthumously in 1971 under the title <u>Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropejskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ḳ).</u> Although this and subsequent volumes (Illič-Svityč 1976 and 1984) must be considered the central work of Nostratics to date, many of the early articles are significant studies, either as sources of data or as the theoretical foundations for distant linguistic comparison.

<u>The Theoretical Foundation</u>

The essence of Illič-Svityč 1964a is the importance of distinguishing lexical borrowings from genetic cognates. Illič-Svityč notes that among Möller's "fantastic and implausible" comparisons, there is a small group of cognates which, as cultural items, are unlikely to form the basis of a Semitic-IE proto-language, as Möller had assumed. He shows that these cognates, due to the nature of their root structure,[4] can best be explained as borrowings from Semitic into IE. Moreover, the presence of good etymologies in AA and their absence in IE supports this interpretation. Illič-Svityč's interest in borrowing may also be seen in Illič-Svityč 1965, where examples of

borrowing to and from Caucassian languages (North and South) are deduced.

Dolgopolsky 1964a was intended as a guide for determining whether further etymological study of a group of languages is warranted, but important considerations on the nature of lexical change are implicit in this work. He begins by presenting a programmatic study for explaining phonetic similarities between two morphemes with similar semantics, noting there are only three possible explanations: pure coincidence, borrowing, and genetic affinity. Dolgopolsky stresses the importance of using more than one language (language family) in comparison. When only two languages are compared, the probability that the results will be contaminated by chance phonetic similarities is high.

Dolgopolsky proceeds to show that not all lexemes are suitable for comparison, that in fact a hierarchy of stability exists for lexemes, i.e., certain lexemes are less likely to be replaced by others when two languages come into contact. Dolgopolsky's investigation of lexical substitution in 140 languages from diverse families (with a small bias to IE) led him to derive the following list of following stable lexemes: 1. '1st person'; 2. 'two'; 3. '2nd person'; 4. 'who, what'; 5. 'tongue'; 6. 'name'; 7. 'eye'; 8. 'heart'; 9. 'tooth'; 10. 'negative and prohibitive particle'; 11. 'finger/toe nail'; 12. 'louse'; 13. 'tear' (n.); 14. 'water'; 15. 'dead'; 16. 'hand'; 17.

'night'; 18. 'blood'; 19. 'horn'; 20. 'full'; 21. 'sun'; 22. 'ear'; 23. 'salt'. Using the 15 most stable sememes, Dolgopolsky examined the forms in seven language families: IE, AA, Uralic, Altaic, Chukchee-Kamchatkan, Kartvelian, and Sumerian. A number of cognate sets were derived, some were interpreted as borrowings, others as genetic cognates, but the possibility that coincidence could explain so many similarities was excluded. His conclusion concerning the seven families was that the first six are related to each other, while Sumerian is not.

Thus, both Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky considered and rejected borrowing for those sets which comprised the Nostratic data of their early articles. At about the same time that Dolgopolsky 1964a presented a general juxtaposition of phonetically similar items, the first attempts to reconstruct the proto-language can be found in Illič-Svityč 1964b, where it was pointed out that IE labial velars corresponded to Uralic *kU (where U = o, u or ü), IE palatal velars corresponded to Uralic *kE (E = e, i, ä), and IE plain velars corresponded to Uralic *ka. Dolgopolsky 1964c presented 166 sets of lexical correspondences between IE, Uralic, Altaic, AA, Kartvelian, and Chukchee-Kamchatkan. The material was arranged according to regular phonetic correspondences, but no attempt at reconstruction of the proto language was made. Many of these sets later became part of the Nostratic Dictionary, some were rejected, and others reinterpreted. For example,

for set #152 (IE *Ḱerd- 'heart'~ Kart. mk̡erd- 'breast'~ Sem. krb 'viscera, thorax') the comparison of the IE - Kartvelian data was retained, Cushitic data were added, and the Semitic data were incorporatated into another root, resulting in Nst. **k̡Erdʌ 'heart' [Illič-Svityč 1971:324-5] and **K̡arbi 'abdomen, viscera' [Illič-Svityč 1971:338-40].

Although as far as publication dates are concerned it is chronologically out of place, clearly the next article to be written was Illič-Svityč 1968, which is mentioned already in the bibliography of Illič-Svityč 1964c. Here he reconstructs the Nostratic stops and provides nearly 200 sets as evidence. In addition, the reconstruction of the stops within each family (IE, AA, Kartvelian, Uralic, Altaic, Dravidian) and their development from Nostratic are discussed. However, no Nostratic forms or reconstructed semantics are provided.

<u>The Reconstruction of Nostratic</u>

The first reconstruction of the Nostratic proto-language was given in Illič-Svityč 1967 (and from here known as "Materialy"). The data were arranged according to reconstructed semantics (Russian alphabetic order). Tables of phonetic correspondences for all phonemes (not just stops) and 607 sets (the number of reconstructed Nostratic roots is slightly less) are provided. Within each set each family's proto-form is reconstructed and bibliographic information is furnished. Slightly more than half of these

comparisons are binary, and on average 2.75 language families are involved in each comparison. At this point one may speak of the "canonization" of Nostratic in that the languages under comparison and phonetic correspondences become fairly well established, although a number of changes are introduced in the first volume of the Nostratic Dictionary (Illič-Svityč 1971) and research in the 1980's has further modified the Nostratic phonological system.

The Dictionary is a more conservative and complete work. Although there are more roots in the "Materialy" (the three volumes of the Dictionary published to date contain 378 entries), the reconstructed form for each language family is supplemented by the words from individual languages and apparent incongruities are explained. It is clear that the Dictionary maintains a more cautious approach to reconstruction. Of the 36 words in b- found in "Materialy," 26 were included in the Dictionary (and 6 new roots were added). Nine of the 10 excluded items were binary comparisons, which suggests that their genetic affinity has not necessarily been rejected, but simply not yet proven. In the Dictionary more than 63% of the entries entail comparison of more than two language families and on average 2.98 language families are involved in each comparison.

The Dictionary, and this can be said of Nostratics in general, is a work very much "in progress." "Materialy" provides data on 256 roots in P-, Q-, R-, S-, T-, w-, and

Z-, of which only 26 can be found in the Dictionary (14 in volume II, 12 in volume III). In his foreword to Illič-Svityč 1976 (Volume 2), Dybo remarked that these (i.e. dictionary entries in P- through Z-) were "experimental entries written by the author before he began writing the corpus of the dictionary."[5] Nevertheless, judging by the data of volume I (b-Ķ), we can assume that a significant percent of the P-Z data from the "Materialy" eventually will be accepted. In fact, Dybo notes that the mass of etymological research done over the 18 years from the time of Illič-Svityč's death to the publication of volume III "in the majority of cases only helped to strengthen the etymological proposals of the Nostratic Dictionary's author."[6]

The data from "Materialy" underwent a number of modifications before being included in the Dictionary. One phoneme (ñ-) reconstructed in "Materialy" was excluded from the Dictionary, while other phonemes (glottal stop (ʔ) and ŕ) were added. Some phonemes were given different reflexes in the daughter languages. For example, Nostratic **s- gives Uralic *s in "Materialy," but Uralic *ś in the Dictionary, and the reverse is true for **ś. In many instances data from a language family not represented in "Materialy" were added, in some cases data from a family were rejected. Often the reconstruction was modified slightly as more data became available. In the Dictionary Illič-Svityč rejected the notion of Nostratic roots with a vowel in anlaut,

preferring to reconstruct initial laryngeals which were later lost in all the East Nostratic languages (Alt., Ural., Drav.), and whose fate in West Nostratic (IE, AA, Kart.) depended on language family and type of laryngeal. Perhaps the most significant difference is the addition to the Dictionary of over 35 grammatical suffixes and pronouns.

Dolgopolsky through the late sixties and early seventies published a number of articles on specific Nostratic problems: Dolgopolsky 1969 and 1972b are concerned with the reflexes of Nostratic consonant clusters and Dolgopolsky 1974 deals with the phoneme /ʔ/ in Nostratic. In addition, Dolgopolsky assisted Dybo in editing the manuscript of Illič-Svityč 1971 and published a reconstruction of proto-Cushitic. After Dolgopolsky's emigration to Israel in the mid-seventies and the publication of the second volume of the Dictionary in 1976, an apparent lull came over Nostratic studies.

Reviews of the Nostratic Dictionary

The response to the Dictionary has been generally favorable. Ivanov 1974 was lavish in his praise of Illič-Svityč's methodology, in particular stressing the fact that Illič-Svityč distinguished genetic cognates from borrowings. He noted that in many instances he provided new etymologies for data within a language family or group, i.e., Illič-Svityč's contribution to historical linguistics went much further than a simple gathering of existing

etymologies. He emphasized the importance of the Dictionary's explanatory power vis-à-vis problems within individual language families hithereto unexplained and cited numerous examples, including words such as Slavic da (conj.), Grk. thalassa 'sea', Lit. angà 'opening', etc., whose previous etymologies were dubious, at best. In his review of the second volume (Ivanov 1979) he again refers to the differences between Illič-Svityč's work and other, more recent binary comparisons between Indo-European and Semitic (Bomhard) or Indo-European and Uralic (Čop). Ivanov stresses the importance of moving beyond lexical comparisons, which for him are all ambiguous, particularly when the comparison is binary, in that they could be evidence of borrowing at a very early level. It would seem that Ivanov gives little credence to Dolgopolsky's notion of a hierarchy of lexical stability. Therefore, Ivanov places a high premium on the large number of grammatical comparisons found in the Dictionary. There have been a number of shorter favorable reviews, including Birnbaum 1977:51-60, Garde 1977/1978, Poppe 1973, Pisani 1972, Anttila 1972:320-1, Collinder 1974, Bernštejn 1986.

Other reviews have been more critical. Although Serebrennikov 1982 takes note of Illič-Svityč's "impression of virtuosity" and the "meticulous and demanding" nature of the work, in a rambling text he attacks Illič-Svityč's reconstructions of Nostratic grammar after dismissing the lexical sets, since "chance coincidences and

loans can occur." However, much of his criticism is a misreading or distortion of Illič-Svityč's position, as Shevoroshkin and Markey showed in their notes to the translation [Shevoroshkin-Markey 1986:80-86].

Doerfer 1973 and Ščerbak 1984 attempt to discredit Nostratics by attacking its treatment of Altaic in general, the reconstruction of proto-Turkish in particular. This is not the place, nor is the present author the individual, to evaluate the merits of Illič-Svityč's reconstruction of Altaic and Proto-Turkic. Suffice it to say, Altaists are themselves divided on the exact nature of the relationship between the Turkish, Mongolian and Tungus branches of Altaic and the interpretations of the data made by Doerfer and Ščerbak are by no means definitive. Xelimskij (Helimsky) 1986 points out a number of errors or weaknesses in Ščerbak's arguments, and other Altaicists (Menges, Poppe) have been supportive of Illič-Svityč's research in Nostratic in general, and in Altaic in particular.

Similarly, Klimov 1986:139-141 criticizes Illič-Svityč's treatment of Kartvelian. First, he cites the paucity of Kartvelian data vis-à-vis the other families. Second, he uses the large number of sets considered doubtful by Illič-Svityč himself to claim the number of unquestioned sets is only 14. Klimov asserts that of those remaining some are borrowings, some cannot be reconstructed at the Proto-Kartvelian level, and only a "small handful of

Kartvelian-Indo-European parallels might form the subject of genetic research."

It is unfortunate that Klimov criticizes Illič-Svityč for his conservatism, his willingness to openly question a reconstruction if there existed the smallest doubt as to its legitimacy. The fact that a large number of sets in the "Materialy" never made it to the Dictionary and the number of question marks Illič-Svityč places on his own work is sufficient to establish the reticence with which he handled the material. Nevertheless, Klimov's criticism is misleading. He counts only 35 sets with Kartvelian data in volume 1, whereas in fact there are 97 (not including the data from the tables on pp. 6-37). Of the 97, 17 are reconstructed but under question, and 15 are left as unreconstructed curiosities: "It is worthwhile noting..." More often than not in these cases the data exist in only one language and hence cannot be reconstructed for the family. However, that still leaves 65 sets with solid Kartvelian etymologies. Thus, depending on how one treats the set of questionable items and that of curiosities, Kartvelian is represented in 27-40 percent of the sets of Volume One. Those figures compare with the following for language groups within IE: Celtic 45%, Iranian 33%, Armenian 23%, Albanian 16% [Bird 1982], and no one questions the IE nature of those language families.

Klimov's text is also misleading in its treatment of individual etymologies. For example, he notes in passing

that "instead of (Illič-Svityč's) *d- 'lay, put,' Kartvelian scholars usually postulate *dew- 'put, lay,'" leaving the impression that Illič-Svityč had arbitrarily cut the root. In fact, Illič-Svityč [1971:224] interpreted -ew- as an extension of the root and noted his source. As additional proof he cited the form in Svan where the root without the -ew- suffix is preserved. It is possible that Illič-Svityč's interpretation is innovative and correct (and would be another instance where Nostratic is able to assist the decipherment of problems in the daughter languages). In any event, Klimov provides no evidence to dissuade one from Illič-Svityč's interpretation. It would appear that Klimov's comments place him in that group of "anti-Nostraticists" who approach the topic having already made up their minds. As Bernštejn notes with reluctance: "research in this area of linguistics often results in sharp antipathy."[7]

Recent Work in Deep Reconstruction

The past ten years have witnessed a flourish of activity in distant linguistic comparison. A new generation of Soviet linguists has reconstructed a number of families, some of which have been incorporated into macro-families. Nostratic theory and the work of the Moscow school is becoming better known in the West. In addition to the reviews of the Dictionary, English translations of the original Russian works [Shevoroshkin-Markey 1986, Kaiser 1989a, Kaiser 1989b] have or soon will be published, two

symposia devoted to genetic classification were held (at Rice University in March 1986 and at the University of Michigan in November 1988), and a number of items have appeared in the popular media [New York Times (November 24, 1987); "National Public Radio", Science (November 25, 1988)]. At the same time an understanding of the preproto-language encompassing IE, AA, Altaic, etc., has been complicated by the work of Bomhard, who has introduced his own version of Nostratic, which differs in fundamental respects from the work of the Moscow school.

Recent Refinements in Nostratic Theory

First and foremost in importance was the publication of Illič-Svityč 1984. This work, based on the author's notecards, is the fruit of the collective efforts of Dybo's students (see below). The third volume differs from the previous two in the depth and length of the etymologies, which is due in large respect to the massive amount of etymological material in the non-IE families published since the appearance of the first volume. Thus, the bibliography (supplement to the first two volumes) is longer than the one found in either of the first two volumes and the average Dictionary entry runs four pages.

Dolgopolsky 1984 deepens our comprehension of Nostratic grammar by examining the system of Nostratic personal pronouns. In this work, in many respects an extension and further elaboration of Illič-Svityč 1971 and 1971b, he not only describes the evolution of personal

Univ Bibliothek Bochum

pronouns from Nostratic to the various daughter languages, he also is able to deduce a number of Nostratic syntactic rules. Three basic types of words (full words, pronouns, grammatical words) are identified for Nostratic, as well as an Subject-Object-Verb word order.

The Nostratic system of laryngeals was revised in Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1985 and 1988. Specifically it was shown that Illič-Svityč's **ḫ in fact covers two phonemes, **ḫ and **x, and his **γ covers **? and **γ.

The Contributions of Bomhard

Bomhard's comparison of IE and AA is based on the Hopper-Gamkrelidze-Ivanov analysis of IE consonantism. According to their theory a glottalic series T' is posited for IE to replace the mediae D. Three arguments are cited to support the glottalic theory: 1) There are no attested T-D-Dh systems (first noted in Jakobson 1957); 2) IE "*b" is rare, which, according to typological arguments, makes sense if we posit *p', but is inexplicable in the traditional reconstruction; 3) IE root constraint laws cannot be explained logically given a traditional reconstruction, whereas "No roots of the type D-D" becomes "no T'-T'," a restriction not unknown among the world's languages, and "No roots of the type Dh-T or T-Dh" is now explained as no D-T, i.e., mandatory assimilation by voice.

It would appear that the internal IE evidence will prove inconclusive in resolving the exact phonetic nature of IE stops, and that the deciding factor will be whether

independent verifications of the work done by Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky twenty years earlier. However, the work is prone to several methodological errors. Too often Bomhard's IE reconstructions of proto-meanings are influenced by his target comparison in PAA, and vice versa, too often Bomhard truncates a root in one language family in order to set up his comparison,[8] too often the PAA evidence rests on Semitic or Egyptian data alone, and as such is not really an AA reconstruction. The semantic and phonetic distortions are the direct result of incorrect phonetic correspondences, which in turn were caused by the attempt to force the data into the framework of the Glottalic Theory. Bomhard (forthcoming) attempts to correct some of the deficiencies of the earlier work. Here Bomhard provides a broader base for comparison by incorporating data from other Nostratic languages. He is able to avoid some of the pitfalls of binary comparisons first pointed out by Illič-Svityč. Unfortunately, he provides only the head words for each language family, and gives no citations for individual languages or reference to sources, making the reader's task of judging the accuracy of his reconstructions more difficult.

A few examples of Bomhard's errors are given below. The first number is from Bomhard 1984, the second from Bomhard f.c. Data in brackets are new to Bomhard f.c. Many more examples and further criticism of Bomhard 1984 can be found in Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1987.

#51/90. {PN **t[h]am-/**t[h]em- 'to cover over, to hide':} PAA *t[h]əm-/*t[h]am- 'to cover over'; IE *t[h]em/*t[h]om- 'dark, darkness'. There is insufficient semantic basis for the comparison: no IE form shows 'cover, hide, bury', but all are uniform in an IE proto-meaning of 'dark', which is unattested in the Egyptian form, the only evidence cited for AA.

#55/94. {PN **t[h]ik'-/**t[h]ek'- 'to be or become established, firm, solid':} PAA *t[h]ək'-/*t[h]ak'- 'to be or become established, firm, solid'; IE *t[h]ek'-u- 'firm, solid, thick'; {PAlt. *tigirak 'firm, solid, thick'}. The IE forms show only 'thick', no 'firm' or 'solid', and the PAA forms indicate a proto-meaning of 'well ordered, perfect, established'. A possible correspondence is with IE *deḱ: 'good, appropriate'. [Pokorny 1959:189-91]. The Altaic form has no place anywhere (4 consonants ??).

#70/141. {PN *c[h]uk[h]-/c[h]ok[h]- 'to bend, to turn, to wind, to twist; to close, to shut; to cover':} PAA *tsək-/*tsak- {*c[h]ək[h]-/*c[h]ak[h]-}'to bend, turn, twist, cover'; {(?)} PIE *tək(s)-/*tak(s)- 'to bend, turn, twist, wind'; {PU *čukka- 'to bend, to turn, to twist; to close, to shut, to shut up, to shut in'}. It is clear that the proto-meaning in the AA languages was 'cover' (it would prove difficult to derive 'tortoise' from 'to twist'). Dolgopolsky has shown that the IE form is related to Uralic *tuktə 'to build, built', Tungus *toktə 'to hew, axe', Dravidian *toṭṭi 'fence, fenced off plot, a (built) structure', all deriving from Nostratic **ṭuKṭə 'to build, hew'. Bomhard's IE form cannot be put here, even with a question mark, and the PAA forms clearly reflect other roots. [Dolgopolsky 1969:303-4].

#79/126. {PN **t [h]awr- 'bull, steer':} PAA *tʸ[h]awr- 'bull, steer'; IE *t[h]awro- 'bull'. Illič-Svityč 1963:3 showed that certain IE words were borrowed from Proto-Semitic. Bomhard makes no attempt to differentiate common roots from borrowings, a criticism duly noted by Ivanov [Markey-Shevoroshkin 1986:51-65].

#168/247. {PN **kw[h]ar-/**kw[h]er- 'to scratch, to scrape, to dig':} PAA *kw[h]ər-/*kw[h]ar- 'to scratch, scrape, rake, dig'; IE *kw[h]er-/*kw[h]ar-/*kw[h]or-/*kw[h]r̥- 'to draw, drag, plow'; {PFinno-Yukaghir *kur/3/- (or *kara) 'to

dig, to plow'; PDrav. *kār- 'to dig'; PAlt. *kary- 'to scratch, to dig'}. There is no basis for PAA 'scratch, scrape, rake' all the Semitic forms show 'dig'. Moreover, there is no such IE root. Sanskrit kárṣati kṛṣáti 'to draw, drag, plow' < IE *kars- 'to scratch', whereas the attested Slavic forms < PSl. *čara 'a mark, line' < IE *kwer- 'to make'. [Trubačev 1977:22-3].

#169/248. {PN **kw[h]ur-/**kw[h]or- 'body, belly':} PAA *kw[h]ər-/*kw[h]ar- 'belly, body'; PIE *kw[h]er-/*kw[h]or-/*kw[h]r̥- 'belly, body'; {PUral *kur/3/ 'body, form, figure'}. The Semitic forms cited in Bomhard 1984 all show a root in *krs, while Pokorny reconstructs the IE form as *kerp-. The semantics of the Uralic form are too divergent. There is a phonetically correct correspondence for IE *kwerp-/*kwrep- 'belly' : PAA *k'rb 'viscera, abdomen' (Sem. qrb 'id', Eg. q;b 'intestine', ? Cushitic *grb 'abdomen, viscera' (assimilation to voice)) : Alt. *kʿarbi- 'abdomen, belly fat' < Nost. **ḳarb/i/ 'abdomen, viscera'. [Illič-Svityč 1971:338ff.].

#184/261. {PN **k'walb-/**k'welb- 'the inside, middle, center, interior':} PAA *k'walb- 'the inside, middle, center, interior, heart'; IE *k'wəlb-/*k'walb- 'womb, pregnant'. The reconstruction of the labial in PAA is unjustified by any PAA data. The PAA semantics are again skewed to match the IE. The PAA forms clearly show 'heart', while the IE forms show 'womb', 'the young of animals' (as Pokorny correctly reconstructs). 'Inside', 'middle' and the like are secondary developments in Arabic (cf. similar development in Russian for IE *ḱerd- 'heart').

#215/375. {PN **hap[h]-/**hep[h]- 'to turn, to turn away, to turn back':} PAA *həp[h]-/*hap[h]- 'to turn, turn back, turn away'; IE *$h_4$ep[h]o '(turned) away, back'. Unfortunately, the IE provide no justification for 'turned', even in parentheses. The PAA data permit a reconstruction only of 'to turn'.

Illič-Svityč's reconstructions are more convincing than those of Bomhard, his citations from individual languages superior, and documentation of secondary sources

more extensive. He accounts for internal developments within language families. He delves deep into the reconstruction and rejects deceptive surface similarities. And although in shear numbers he has fewer sets than Bomhard, most of the latter's sets must be rejected for the reasons noted above (Palmaitis was able to retain less than a third of the reconstructions in Bomhard 1984).

We may return now to the first alternative in the analysis of reconstructed IE glottalics, i.e., that the transition from Nostratic to PIE involved a 'flip-flop' in the glottalic and voiceless series. As noted above, this would not affect the correspondences established by Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky, but only the phonetics of traditional IE mediae. However, the evidence for the Glottalic Theory encounters further difficulties when borrowings between proto-languages are taken into account. An analysis of those words which are considered borrowings from Semitic into IE and from IE into Kartvelian fails to support the Glottalic Theory, because IE did not use its purported glottalic consonants to render Semitic glottalics, nor were purported IE glottalics rendered by means of glottalics in Kartvelian. [Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1986 for details, and #121 and 127 below].

Reconstruction of Other Macro-Families

The most significant contribution to the study of distant linguistic relations since the pioneering work of Illič-Svityč and Dolgopolsky have been the efforts of V.

A. Dybo, who wrote introductions to and edited all three volumes of the Dictionary. Perhaps more important have been his efforts to teach a new generation of linguists, who have continued the work of deep reconstruction, for the most part in non-Nostratic languages.

As was the case with Illič-Svityč's and Dolgopolsky's reconstruction of Nostratic, this group of talented linguists has maintained a rigorous observance of phonetic and semantic correspondences in establishing new language families. In addition, they have recognized the need to differentiate borrowings from genetic cognates [Nikolaev-Starostin 1984, Starostin 1985].

Nikolaev and Starostin have reconstructed Proto-North-Caucasian [Starostin-Nikolaev 1975, 1987; Nikolaev-Starostin 1984], Starostin has reconstructed Proto-Yenissean [Starostin 1982] and Proto-Chinese [Starostin 1987]. Moreover, Starostin has shown that Proto-North-Caucasian, Yenissean, and Sino-Tibetan share many cognates and are genetically related [Starostin 1984]. Other languages and language families tied to this macro-family are Basque [Čirikba 1985] and the Dene languages of North America [Nikolaev 1988], which explains the appelation Dene-Caucasian.

This classification has received indirect confirmation in the works of the American linguists J. Greenberg and M. Ruhlen. They have proposed a third macro-family, called Amerind, to which belong most American Indian

languages. Greenberg 1986 provides a preliminary reconstruction of many Amerind roots. Curiously, Greenberg excludes from Amerind the Eskimo-Aleutian and Athapascan languages. It has already been noted that Nikolaev includes Athapascan in the North-Caucasian macro-family, and preliminary reports of ongoing research [Mudrak 1984, 1988] place Eskimo-Aleut in the Nostratic languages.

At this time distant linguistic comparison appears to have a particularly promising future. Preliminary research indicates that there exists a basis for comparison of macro-families. Several sets of stable words have been found between Nostratic and Amerind, Nostratic and Sino-Caucasian, and finally Amerind and the tentatively reconstructed macro-family, Macro-Asiatic. The latter have a number of exceedingly stable words in common, including the personal pronouns *nV 'I' and *mV 'thou'.

Although many scholars consider such comparisons highly speculative, or at best premature, it is clear that the work of Dolgopolsky and Illič-Svityč has reinvigorated historical linguistics. Their research is firmly based in the comparative method, and no criticism has brought into question more than a few of their sets.

The reconstruction of Nostratic is of the utmost significance for our understanding of the various daughter languages. It serves as a control on the <u>internal reconstruction</u> of IE, just as IE acts as a control on our reconstruction of Common Slavic. Moreover, it can also

directly affect our reconstruction of Slavic, as we shall try to show in the next chapter.

Endnotes to Chapter I

1. The term Nostratic was an unfortunate choice. In Dolgopolsky 1967 the case was made for "borejskij" (i.e. Borealic), but the term Nostratic had already been established (cf. Pedersen and Cuny).

2. Trombetti is an interesting exception, in that he compared many language families and even noted the importance of the Hamitic languages for comparisons of IE with AA. However, at the time of his writing the comparative method was still not fully understood and the language families which he tried to compare with IE were so poorly defined that his results could not help but be flawed.

3. Bomhard makes the same error.

4. For example, native IE words would not feature juxtaposition of two sonants, as in *tauro- 'bull'.

5. Illič-Svityč 1976, p. 5.

6. Dybo 1984, p. 6.

7. Bernštejn 1986:3:41.

8. There is no evidence to support the notion that all Proto-Semitic roots were at one time biconsonantal, which Bomhard uses to justify truncation whenever it suits his purposes. Nostratic roots of the type CVRCV or CVCRV are reflected in Semitic as CRC or CCR: Nost. **balʕ/u/ 'swallow' > PSem. *blʕ 'id'; Nost. **dalq/u/ 'wave' > PSem. *dlh 'be upset, to agitate'; Nost. **ńaʕrʌ 'young, newborn' > PSem. *nʕr, etc. Nostratic roots of the type CVCV became CC(C) in Semitic.

CHAPTER II

SLAVIC REFLEXES OF NOSTRATIC ROOTS

Each entry below traces the development of a Nostratic lexeme through IE and into Slavic, as reconstructed by Illič-Svityč, with certain minor modifications.[1] Each entry also shows the distribution of the Nostratic, IE, and Slavic roots in the respective daughter languages (+ indicates the presence of the root, 0 its absence, and ? represents either a doubtful reconstruction or one based on isolated forms). In general the Slavic data were restricted to the primary form, and if secondary developments were taken into account at all, then only briefly. This is followed by a commentary on Illič-Svityč's interpretations of the data when they differ significantly from those of Pokorny, Trubačev, or Vasmer. Finally, bibliographic data are provided for each entry.

Items #1-141 below are from the Dictionary, items #142-224 are from the "Materialy," and items #225-230 are Slavic isolates from both sources, i.e., Slavic is mentioned, but no IE reconstruction has been provided. In the Dictionary Illič-Svityč provided a complete reconstruction. He cites words in individual languages, reconstructs the proto-form for the family, and then reconstructs the Nostratic form. Therefore, it is a relatively easy matter to see exactly how his approach

differs from Vasmer's and Trubačev's.

In the "Materialy" no data on individual languages are provided,[2] only family reconstructions are given. On the surface it would appear that in "Materialy" Illič-Svityč took Pokorny's analysis at face value, but one frequently finds "Cf. Pokorny xxx," (instead of "Pokorny xxx"), which is to say that he does not entirely agree with Pokorny, but does not elaborate on the nature of the disagreement. In such cases it is very difficult to ascertain exactly which cognates in IE Illič-Svityč had planned to retain, and which he had decided to reject, although his Nostratic comparisons do provide a clue. Therefore, for the purposes of this paper greater attention was given to the items from the Dictionary, and for the analysis of distribution (Chapter III) the "Materialy" and Slavic isolates were disregarded entirely.

Slavic Lexical Data from the Dictionary

[1] Slavic *asenъ/*asenь 'ash' < IE *Hos- 'ash' < ? Nst. **Hosʌ 'ash':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

The similarity of the Uralic and IE data has long been ascribed to borrowing, an interpretation which Illič-Svityč notes as possible, but which fails to explain Uralic *ś < IE *s.

Illič-Svityč 1971:255; Pokorny 782; Trubačev 1:79-80; Vasmer 4:564; Friedrich 1970:92-98.

[2] Slavic *bergъ 'bank, incline' < IE *bherǵh-/*bhreǵh- 'high, high place' < Nst. **berg/i/ 'high':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	0	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Slavic and Albanian show velar g for the expected palatal ǵ. According to Illič-Svityč and the traditional view, this is explained as the result of borrowing from a Kentum language. Trubačev suggests "an expressive velarization of the palatal g, the cause of which is rooted in the emotive power of 'tall.' If we accept Illič-Svityč's view, then there is no native Slavic form from IE *bherǵh- and the distribution above would need to be corrected.

Illič-Svityč 1971:177; Pokorny 140-1; Trubačev I:191-3; Vasmer I:153.

[3] Slavic *bebrъ, *bobrъ, *bъbrъ 'beaver' < IE *bhe-bhru- (redup.) 'beaver' < *bher-, *bhreu- 'brown' < Nst. **boŕa 'brown, grey-brown':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Both Baltic and Slavic retain the archaic u-stem. Russian buryj and Polish bury are borrowings from Iranian languages, perhaps via Turkish, as Vasmer indicates. Only Germanic and Baltic retain an archaic non-reduplicated stem.

Illič-Svityč 1971:183-4; Pokorny 136-7; Trubačev 1:174-5, 2:145-6, 3:159; Vasmer 1:141, 1:180-1, 1:249; Toporov 1:203-5.

[4] Slavic *bedro 'thigh, hip' < IE *bhe/dh/- 'hip' < Nst. **ṗoǯqa/**ṗodqa 'hip':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev rejects Vasmer's comparison with Lat. femen, femur 'thigh, femur', preferring to see in *bedro a substantivized adjective from *bed-/*bod- 'beat'. In general the Slavic - Italic comparison has won little support.

Illič-Svityč 1976:102-3; Trubačev 1:179-80; Vasmer 1:143.

[5] Slavic *berǫ 'I take' < IE *bher- 'take, bring, carry' < Nst. **bari 'take':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč states that Slavic is the only IE language to retain the archaic meaning 'take'. On the other hand, Trubačev sees such Slavic forms as *berdja 'pregnant (of animals)' and *bermę 'pregnant' as retaining archaic IE semantics, thereby implying that the semantics of the Slavic verb are an innovation. Inasmuch as *berdja and *berme are clearly deverbative formations, the only satisfactory accounting for the developments in Slavic from the Nostratic point of view is to assume that IE (Slavic included) developed a secondary meaning 'carry' and concomitant deverbative formations. Most IE languages continued the semantic development to 'bring' while at the same time losing 'take', whereas Slavic reverted to 'take.' Inasmuch as the other IE languages are very uniform in their loss of 'take', Slavic must have broken apart from IE at about the time that these semantic innovations were in progress and prior to the break up of the other dialects, i.e., at a relatively early date. Of course this postulated early separation of Slavic from IE would have ocurred after the separation of the Anatolian languages from IE. Dolgopolsky is the most recent of the many supporters of Sturtevant's Indo-Hittite

hypothesis.

Illič-Svityč 1971:176-7; Pokorny 128-32; Trubačev 1:188-9, 1:196-7, 3:162-3; Vasmer I:159.

[6] Slavic *běg- 'run, flee' < IE *bheug-/*bheg^u- 'flee' < Nst. **bok/a/ 'flee':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:181; Pokorny 152,116; Trubačev 2:58-62; Vasmer 1:143; Toporov 1:206-7.

[7] Slavic *blędǫ (*blęsti) 'mix up' < ? IE *bhl-endh- 'turbid; mix' < Nst. **bulʌ 'precipitation, mud':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+

Slavic semantics are far from uniform: *blęsti: 'talk nonsense', 'become lost', 'become gloomy, overcast', 'to blaspheme', 'be mistaken'; *blǫdъ: 'debauchery', 'error', 'delusion'; *blǫditi: 'wander', 'debauche', 'talk nonsense', 'become lost'. A similar diffusion of semantics can be seen in Baltic 'drowsiness', 'cloudy weather', 'murky, dark', 'sleep; mix food with flour' and in Germanic: 'blind', 'mix', 'become murky', 'blend', 'blind'. The semantic development could have been 'mix(ed), stir(red) up' > 'clouded, confused' > '(moral) error, delusion', 'blind'. Pokorny errantly connects these to *bhel- 'white, shining', i.e. > 'blinding'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:185-6; Pokorny 157-8; Trubačev 2:114-5, 2:125-8; Vasmer 1:180; Fraenkel 47-8.

[8] Slavic *blъxa 'flea' < IE *bhlus-/*plus- 'flea' < ?Nst. **pur̤čʌ(ʌ)/**pülčʌ(9ʌ) 'flea':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	?	?	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Dolgopolsky includes this etymon on his list of most stable lexemes. IE *bhlus- and *plus- are in complementary distribution, except for Germanic, which shows both forms.

Illič-Svityč 1976:99-100; Trubačev 2:129-30; Vasmer 1:176-7.

[9] Slv. *bolěti, *bolь 'pain' < IE *bheHl- 'wound, pain' < ?Nst. **baHli 'wound, pain':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Attempts by Trubačev to link this etymon with Slavic *bolьjь 'more, bigger', OI. bála-m 'strength, power', Grk. beltiōn 'best' < IE *bel- 'strong' conflict with the Nostratic data, which show Slavic to retain archaic semantics. Persian *balā 'accident, misfortune', Cymric bala 'plague' and Ir. bealaim 'to die' could all be added to Illič-Svityč's entry.

Illič-Svityč 1971:172; Trubačev 2:187-9, 2:191-4; Trubačev 1958:124-5; Vasmer I:191.

[10] Slavic *bolto 'swamp' (> 'mud, standing water') < IE *bolH-/*pelH- 'swamp' < ?Nst. **palʌ 'swamp':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Pokorny, Trubačev, Vasmer, and the majority of scholars compare the Slavic form with Lit. báltas 'white', derived from IE *bhelH- 'white'. Illič-Svityč points out that this fails to explain OI jam-bālas 'swamp, slime, mud' and Alb. baltë 'slime, mud, swamp' which show IE *b-, not *bh-.

Illič-Svityč 1976:97-8; Pokorny 119, 799; Trubačev 2:179-82; Vasmer 1:190.

[11] Slavic *bor-ti 'struggle' < IE *bher- 'bore, dig, prick' < Nst. **bura 'to bore':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč's IE set includes Lat. forāre 'to bore, drill', OHG borōn 'drill', Alb. birë (< *bhr̥-) 'hole', which differ from the traditional comparisons with Lat. ferīre 'beat, chop, poke', OHG berjan 'beat, knock, attack', Alb. bie 'I beat'. Clearly the semantic development favors the traditional analysis; however, the o-vocalism of Illič-Svityč's forms (Lat., Slv., Gmc., Blt.) is noteworthy. In Illič-Svityč 1967:363 these forms were compared to Slavic *borna 'furrow'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:186-7; Pokorny 133-5; Trubačev 2:213-4; Vasmer 1:197.

[12] Slavic *bura, *búra 'storm' < IE *bher- 'storm, to rage, seethe' < Nst. **burʌ 'snow-/sandstorm':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Trubačev notes the comparisons between Slavic forms and Latvian bauruot 'to moo, roar', but this is clearly an (onomatopoetic) innovation. Nostratic data also cast doubt on Trubačev's attempt to link Slavic *buna/*búna to *bura.

Illič-Svityč 1971:188-90; Pokorny 131; Trubačev 3:97-9; Vasmer 1:250.

[13] Slavic *by-ti 'be', *bylь 'herb' < IE *bheuH- 'grow up, become, be' < Nst. **buHi 'to grow up, arise':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	byti
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+	bylь

Slavic retains traces of archaic semantics in 'plant, grass' < 'grow'. Trubačev considers Slavic *bylь derivative from *byti.

Illič-Svityč 1971:184-5; Pokorny 146-50; Trubačev 3:149-50, 3:155; Toporov 1:271-274; Vasmer 1:259, 1:260.

[14] Slavic *čelo 'forehead, head, face, cheek' < IE *ḳelH- 'rise, raise; mountain, hill' < Nst. **ḳaLi 'raise, rise':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:334-5; Pokorny 544; Trubačev 4:45-7; Vasmer 4:327.

[15] Slavic *čel'adь 'family' < IE *kwel- 'clan, family' < Nst. **Ķülä 'community, clan':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	?	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	0	+

Trubačev sees -jadь as a collective suffix on *čelo 'forehead', which derives from IE *kel- 'raise, rise'. Illič-Svityč's IE comparisons (OI. kúlam 'kin, family; crowd, multitude'; Grk. telos 'detachment, crowd'; OIr. cland 'descendants, generation, kin', Welsh plant 'children, descendants'; ?Lit. kiltìs 'tribe') are rejected by Trubačev for various reasons: OI. kúlam is considered a borrowing from Dravidian, OIr. cland - a borrowing from Lat. planta 'plant'; and the Grk. and Lit. words are internal developments. However, neither the Dravidian phonetics, nor the OIr. semantics support Trubačev's analysis.

Illič-Svityč 1971:362-3; Trubačev 4.40-2, 4:45-7; Vasmer 4:330.

[16] Slavic *čerěnъ/ь 'part of the hearth' < IE *ker- 'burn, fry, fire' < Nst. **Ķarʌ 'burn, to fire (pottery)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Trubačev concludes that the Slavic semantics can be divided into two basic sememes: 'device for catching fish, net' and 'a part of the hearth, device for drying objects over a fire', which Trubačev considers to have evolved from one word 'net, mesh above the fire' < IE *kwer-/*ker- 'weave'. However, Trubačev provides no other IE cognates.

Illič-Svityč 1971:340; Pokorny 571-2; Trubačev 4:64-5; Trubačev 1966:204-7; Vasmer 4:340.

[17] Slavic *červo 'abdomen, womb' < IE (*Kerp-)/*Krep-

'abdomen, body' < Nst. **Ķarb/i/ 'abdomen, viscera':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

A number of Slavic languages demonstrate meanings which argue against Trubačev's reconstruction of 'hide covering abdomen' as the original semantics, e.g., Blg. červó 'intestine', Cz. střevo 'intestine', OR. čerevo 'abdomen, belly, womb', and 'intestine' > 'river bend'. With the exception of Pruss. kērmens 'abdomen', Trubačev denies any other IE cognates. Toporov claims 'abdomen' is incorrect and the only proper meaning for Pruss. kērmens is 'body' which he relates to OI. cárman 'hide, skin' and Slavic *čermъ 'tent' (< 'covered with hide').

Illič-Svityč 1971:338-340; Pokorny 620; Trubačev 4:82-3; Vasmer 4:337; Toporov 3:326-31.

[18] Slavic *čes-a-ti 'scratch' < IE *kes- 'scratch' < Nst. **Ķašʌ 'scrape, scratch':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

The presence of a Nostratic etymology for both Slavic *kosa 'hair, braid' (which according to Vasmer and Illič-Svityč belongs here) and *kosa 'scythe' (see below #48) contradicts Trubačev's attempts to link them genetically.

Illič-Svityč 1971:343-4; Pokorny 585-6; Trubačev 4:85-7; Vasmer 4:349-50.

[19] Slavic *-čęti 'begin, conceive', *konъ 'begin', *čędo 'child' < IE *ken- 'be born, young' < Nst. **Ḳanʌ 'give birth to, be born':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	-čęti
+	+		0	+	0	0	+		+	0	+	konъ
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		+	0	+	čędo

Illič-Svityč 1971:335-6; Pokorny 563-4; Trubačev 4:102-4, 4:109, 10:195-6; Vasmer 2:307, 3:51.

[20] Slav, *čuti 'feel, hear, look' < IE *(s)keuH- 'look' < Nst. **ćuHʌ 'look':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:202-3; Pokorny 929; Trubačev 4:134-6; Vasmer 4:390.

[21] Slavic *čьrnъ 'black, dark' < Late IE *kr̥-sno- < IE *ker-, *ker-s- 'black, dark' < Nst. **Ḳar/ä/ 'black, dark colored':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:337-8; Pokorny 573, 583; Trubačev 4:155-7; Vasmer 4:346; Toporov 4:26-8.

[22] Slavic *čьrvь 'worm' < IE *kwr̥-mi- 'worm', ?*kwer-

'chew up, break up' < Nst. **Ḳorʌ 'gnaw, worm':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč considers 'worm' derived from 'gnaw, chew up'. Trubačev claims the Slavic form is an innovation. For Illič-Svityč's comparison the Slavic *-v- is problematic, although a Slavic *-v- : IE *-m- is not unprecedented: see Slavic *červo 'abdomen' : Prussian kērmens 'abdomen' (see above, #17), as well as Slavic *pьrvъ 'first' : Lat. primus 'first'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:358-9; Pokorny 649; Trubačev 4:171-2, 4:148; Vasmer 4:335-6.

[23] Slavic *daviti 'oppress' < IE *dheu- 'die, lose consciousness' < Nst. **dʌwʌ 'be ill, die':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev claims Slavic retains an archaic feature of causativity, which was lost in Germanic. However, Nostratic data point to the opposite: causativity in this case was an innovation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:224-5; Pokorny 260-1; Trubačev 4:198-9; Vasmer 1:481.

[24] Slavic *dě(ja)ti 'put' < IE *dheH- 'lay, stand' < Nst. **dʌʔʌ 'lay':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev sees innovation in Slavic's semantic development 'put' > 'make' > 'say'. Although there is typological evidence supporting this argument (cf. English "How should I put it"), this hypothesis must be rejected. Nostratic data prove the existence of separate roots 'put' and 'say', both of which were preserved in Hittite and Slavic. See #146.

Illič-Svityč 1971:224; Pokorny 235-9; Trubačev 4:229-30; Vasmer 1:509.

[25] Slavic *dǫga 'rainbow' < IE *dhengh- 'cover, press' < Nst. **danga 'to cover':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč follows Pokorny and Vasmer in separating the IE sememes 'belt', 'tie' (Slavic *dęga) from 'cover, arch' (Slavic dǫga), which Trubačev brings together into one nest. A separate issue is the treament of Slavic *dǫga 'health, strength', which Pokorny and Vasmer connect with *dęga 'belt'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:217; Trubačev 5:24-5, 98-9; Vasmer 1:549-50.

[26] Slavic *duti 'blow' < IE *dheuH- 'shake, blow' < Nst. **dEwHi 'shake, blow':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Following Nostratic data, all forms with a nasal (dymъ 'smoke', *dъmǫ (*dǫti) 'I blow') must be secondary.

Illič-Svityč 1971:217-8; Pokorny 261-3; Trubačev 5:99-100, 166, 203; Vasmer 1:555-6.

[27] Slavic *e (demonstrative pronoun 'this') < IE *Hei-/*He- (demonstrative pronoun, 3rd sg. ps. pronoun 'this, he') < Nst. **?i/(?)?e (demonstrative pronoun 'this'):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	?	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	+

Trubačev concurs with Illič-Svityč in reconstructing a demonstrative pronoun for Slavic (cf. Vasmer), although the compared forms in the other IE languages are not the same. Illič-Svityč also includes here Slavic *jǫ (personal pron., 3rd sg. fem. acc.), and the iotization is explained as the result of contamination with forms from IE *io- (see #42).

Illič-Svityč 1971:270-272; Pokorny 319-20; Trubačev 6:7; Vasmer 4:513.

[28] Slavic *elenь 'deer' < IE *Hel-n- 'deer' < Nst. **?ili 'deer':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Reconstructed Slavic *ely (nom.) is particularly archaic.

Illič-Svityč 1971:272-3; Pokorny 303-4; Trubačev 6:20; Vasmer 2:134-5.

[29] Slavic *es- 'be' < IE *Hes- 'be', *Hēs 'sit' < Nst. **?esA 'settle a place, be at a place':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

The root Hēs- 'sit' was lost in Slavic.

Illič-Svityč 1971:268-270; Pokorny 340-3; Trubačev 6:32; Vasmer 2:28.

[30] Slavic *ědmь 'I eat' < IE *Hed- 'eat' < Nst. **?itä 'eat':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Slavic *ěda 'food, taste, anger, appetite' and *ědъ 'venum, poison' > 'anger, grief, spite' derive from the verb, which, with its athematic forms, is particularly archaic.

Illič-Svityč 1971:273-4; Pokorny 287-8; Trubačev 6:53-4, 6:38, 6:45-7; Vasmer 2:18.

[31] Slavic *gabati 'seize, grab' < IE *ghabh-/*kap- 'seize, take, hold' < Nst. **ḳaba/**ḳap̣a 'seize': (Onomatopoetic).

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
?	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:313-5; Pokorny 407-9, 527-8; Trubačev 6:76-7.

[32] Slavic *gasiti 'put out', *gasnǫti 'go out' < IE *gwes- 'go out' < Nst. **KuPśa 'put out, extinguish, go out':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:311; Pokorny 479, 649; Trubačev 6:104-5; Vasmer 1:396.

[33] Slavic *golъ 'bare' < IE *gol- 'bare, bald' < Nst. **kal´ʌ 'strip bark, skin':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Pokorny mistakenly brings in forms with 'head' (see below, #134, Slavic *golvā 'head'). Trubačev rejects the Gmc. forms and derives this word from IE *ghel- 'shine', but without internal motivation in Slavic. Such Slavic forms as Slovenian gol 'young tree trunk stripped of branches' and ORus. golь 'branch' might contain traces of archaic Nostratic semantics.

Illič-Svityč 1971:289-90; Pokorny 349; Trubačev 7:14-7; Vasmer 1:433-4.

[34] Slavic *gorěti 'burn', *gērъ 'hot' < IE *gwher- 'burn, hot, hot coals' < Nst. **gUrʌ 'hot coals':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:239; Pokorny 493-5; Trubačev 7:42-3; Toporov 2:276-9; Vasmer 1:441, 2:35.

[35] Slavic *gǫba 'mushroom, sponge' (> 'mouth, lip') < IE *gemb- 'outgrowth; lip, mushroom' < Nst. **kanpʌ 'soft outgrowth':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev (following Illič-Svityč) separates Slavic *gǫba from *guba (see below #37) 'fold, bend' < *gubati 'bend'. However, he derives the former from an IE Wanderwort *sgwhombhos (Grk. sp(h)oggos 'sponge', OHG. swamb 'sponge'), which conflicts with the Nostratic interpretation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:291-2; Trubačev 7:78-80, 7:164-5; Vasmer 1:457-8, 1:468-9.

[36] Slavic *grana, *granъ, *granь 'branch, (sharp) edge'

< IE *gher-, *gherH-/*ghreH- 'thorn, point, branch' < Nst. **gara 'thorny branch, thorn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Vasmer derives 'point' as original meaning, whereas Trubačev points to 'branch' < IE *ghrō-n-, which originally was a participial formation from IE *ghrē-/*ghrō-/*ghrə- 'to grow, to sprout'. Trubačev's analysis would make the Slavic semantics secondary and hence invalidate Illič-Svityč's comparison as far as the Slavic data are concerned.

Illič-Svityč 1971:226; Pokorny 447; Trubačev 7:104-6; Vasmer 1:452-3.

[37] Slavic *guba 'a fold, bend', gъbnǫti, 'bend' < IE *gheub- 'bend, curved, crooked' < Nst. **güpA 'to bend':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč's data further support the delimitation of *guba 'fold' from *gǫba 'lip; mushroom', the latter deriving from IE *sgwhombhos.

Illič-Svityč 1971:236-7; Pokorny 450; Trubačev 7:78-80, 164-5, 188-9; Vasmer 1:468-469.

[38] Slavic *jaro, *jara, *jarъ 'spring' < IE *i̯eHr- 'spring, year' < Nst. **ńaʕrʌ 'young, newborn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:83-5; Pokorny 296-7; Trubačev 8:175-80; Vasmer 4:559.

[39] Slavic *jasati 'to girdle', *po-jasъ 'belt, girdle' < IE *ieHs- 'belt, girdle' < Nst. **jaHU (or **joHʌ) 'to bandage, girdle':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:278-9; Pokorny 513; Trubačev 8:181-2; Vasmer 3:351.

[40] Slavic *juda 'mythical being carried along by whirlwind', *juditi 'lure, seduce, incite' < IE *i̯eudh- 'move quickly, do battle' < Nst. **ńowda 'move quickly':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	+		+	0	+	0	0		+	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:90-1; Pokorny 511-2; Trubačev 8:191-2; Vasmer 4:528.

[41] Slavic *junъ 'young' < IE *Hieu-no- 'young' (type-II stem to IE *heiu- 'life force') < Nst. **ḫaju 'to live, life force':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Trubačev analyzes Slavic *junъ 'young, soft' as a participial formation in -n- ('crumpled') < IE *iouəno- < IE *ieuə- 'stir, knead, crumple'. This interpretation fails to account for such IE forms as Ir. aes 'century', Got. aiws 'time', OI. ayus 'life force', which formally and semantically support Illič-Svityč.

Illič-Svityč 1971:242-3; Pokorny 17-8, 510-1; Trubačev 8:195-7; Vasmer 4:531.

[42] Slavic *jь (že) (relative pronoun 'which') < IE *io- (relative pronoun 'which') < Nst. **ja (interrogative and relative pronoun 'which, who'):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Pokorny attempts to tie this to *hei-/*he-.

Illič-Svityč 1971:277-8; Pokorny 383; Trubačev 8:204-5; Vasmer 2:118-9.

[43] Slavic *jьmati (*jeml'ǫ) 'take' < IE *Hem- 'take' < Nst. **ʔEmʌ 'to seize, take':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč declined to include Grk. nemō 'take, divide' and Got. niman 'receive, take', a grouping which was corroborated by Benveniste. Individual Slavic languages show some semantic innovation, esp. 'begin' (cf. Eng. 'take up').

Illič-Svityč 1971:270; Pokorny 310-1; Trubačev 6:71; 8:224-5; Vasmer 1:311, 2:19, 2:128; 4:569-70; Benveniste 1973:69-70.

[44] Slavic *jьti 'go' < IE *Hei- 'go' < Nst. **?ejʌ 'arrive come':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:265-267; Pokorny 293-7; Trubačev 8:247-8; Vasmer 2:117-8.

[45] Slavic *kolo 'wheel, circle' < IE *kwel- 'round, rotate' < Nst. **ḳolʹʌ 'round':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	?	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev shows that of the two IE roots for 'wheel', *kwolo- is more archaic than *roto-.

Illič-Svityč 1971:326-7; Pokorny 639-40; Trubačev 10:141-4; Vasmer 2:289-90.

[46] Slavic *kopati 'dig' < IE *ke(H)p- 'chop, dig' <

**ḳaHPʌ 'chop, dig': (Onomatopoetic).

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev sees 'beat' as the original semantics of *kopati and then ties this with *kapati 'drip' by means of reconstructed semantics 'fall'. There is no external evidence for this interpretation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:317-8; Trubačev 9:144-6, 11:18-20; Vasmer 2:317.

[47] Slavic *kora 'bark, crust, skin' < IE *ker- 'bark, skin' < Nst. **Ḳaŕä 'bark, crust, rind':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Trubačev claims Slavic *kora < IE *(s)ker- 'cut', by which the Slavic semantic development (> 'bark' and 'hide') is explained as 'that which is cut'. Armenian kʿertʿem 'I skin, I bark' supports this interpretation, which encumbers Illič-Svityč's Nostratic reconstruction.

Illič-Svityč 1971:341-3; Pokorny 938-947; Trubačev 11:44-5; Vasmer 2:320.

[48] Slavic *kosa 'scythe' < IE *ḱes- 'cut' < Nst. **ḳäćä 'cut':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev follows Brückner in claiming Slavic *kosa I 'braid, hair' and *česati 'scratch, comb (hair)' as the original semantics and *kosa II 'scythe' > *kositi 'cut, mow' as a metaphorical extension of *kosa I. This interpretation ignores the IE cognates which are uniform in 'cut', as well as the evidence of Nostratic (see above #18).

Illič-Svityč 1971:320-1; Trubačev 4:85-7, 11:131-5; Vasmer 2:344-5, 4:349-40.

[49] Slavic *kostь 'bone' < IE *Kos-t- 'bone, rib' < Nst. **ḲaSʌ 'bone':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev and Illič-Svityč agree (and in so doing take issue with the majority of etymologists) that Slavic *kostь and *ostь 'sharp' are unrelated. Trubačev, however, rejects the comparison with Lat. costa 'rib' and relates *kostь to IE *kes- 'scratch', in which case we would have Slavic semantic innovation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:344; Pokorny 616; Trubačev 11:167-73; Vasmer 2:349.

[50] Slavic *košio- 'basket' < IE *kwos- 'woven basket, woven article' < Nst. **ḲUĆʌ 'woven basket':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev relates this to Slavic *košelь 'basket', both of which he derives from IE *kes- 'scratch, comb'. However, neither the semantics, nor the phonetics (cf. Latin forms which all show a labiovelar) support this interpretation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:365; Trubačev 11:187-9, 11:195-7; Trubačev 1966:163-4; Vasmer 2:359-60.

[51] Slavic *kotъ (> *kotьcь) 'woven structure' < IE *ket- '(plaited) structure; vessel' < Nst. **Ḳadʌ 'to weave, plait (with twigs)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	+

Trubačev considers Slavic *kotъ < IE *kat- 'weave' "improbable," prefering to see Iranian > Slavic > Germanic borrowing.

Illič-Svityč 1971:316-7; Pokorny 586-7; Trubačev 11:211-2, 11:214-5; Trubačev 1967:24; Vasmer 2:351-2.

[52] Slavic *kry, gen. *krъve 'blood' < IE *kreuH- 'coagulated blood, bloody meat' < ?Nst. **Ḳurʌ 'blood':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev reconstructs 'oozing, flowing blood' for IE, which would not affect the Nostratic form.

Illič-Svityč 1971:360-1; Pokorny 621-2; Trubačev 13:67-70; Vasmer 2:379.

[53] Slavic *kupa, *kupъ 'pile, group' < IE *keup-/*keub-

'pile' < Nst. **ḳU/p/a 'pile, heap':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

The Slavic forms derive from IE *koup-, with the o-vocalism typical of nouns.

Illič-Svityč 1971:366-7; Pokorny 590-1; Trubačev 13:107-8, 13:114-5; Vasmer 2:418-9.

[54] Slavic *kъ-to 'who' < IE *kwo 'who' < Nst. **ḳo 'who':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč points out that Indo-Iranian and Slavic are particularly archaic in preserving the distinction between IE *kwo-s 'who' and IE *kw-i-D 'what' (Slavic *kъ-to vs. čь-to / čь-so).

Illič-Svityč 1971:355-6; Pokorny 644-8; Trubačev 4:173-4, 4:177-8; 13:248; Vasmer 2:393-4, 4:374.

[55] Slavic *kypěti 'boil' < IE *keup-/*keuHp- 'boil, evaporate' < Nst. **ḳüpä 'boil, swell up':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:363-5; Pokorny 596-7; Trubačev 13:265; Vasmer 2:235-6.

[56] Slavic *lapa 'paw, hand', *lopata 'spade, shovel' < IE *lep- 'palm, paw' < Nst. **łapa 'flat':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev considers the Slavic forms tied to the verb *lapati 'devour' and onomatopoetic in origin.

Illič-Svityč 1976:23-5; Pokorny 679; Trubačev 14:26-8; Vasmer 2:458, 2:518-9.

[57] Slavic *ležati 'lie, lie down' < IE *legh- 'lie, lie down' < Nst. **LΛga 'lie':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:35-6; Pokorny 658-9; Trubačev 14:99-100, 14:161-5; Vasmer 2:475.

[58] Slavic *lěp-i-ti 'stick to' < IE *leip- 'stick to, sticky, smear with grease/fat' < Nst. **lipa 'sticky':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:18-20; Pokorny 670-1; Trubačev 14:217-9; Vasmer 2:484.

[59] Slavic *lędo 'field, virgin soil' < IE *lendh- 'valley, plain' < Nst. **Lamd/i/ 'low, depression':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev gives a separate etymology (origin in *lě da) to a wide range of East Slavic forms denoting disease, weakness, foulness. This approach is supported by the Nostratic data.

Illič-Svityč 1976:29-30; Pokorny 675; Trubačev 15:44-8; Vasmer 2:549.

[60] Slavic *lęk- 'bend' (> 'frighten'), *lǫkъ 'bow', *lǫka 'bend of river, pommel of saddle', *lǫčiti 'bend, join' (> 'separate') < IE *lenk- 'bend' < Nst. **łonḳa 'bend':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	0	0	+		+	+	0	lęk-
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	+	lǫkъ
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	lǫka
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+	lǫčiti

Illič-Svityč 1976:27-8; Pokorny 676-7; Trubačev 15:59-61; Vasmer 2:550-1, 2:531-2; 2:537-8.

[61] Slavic *libъ 'thin, weak', *liněti 'weaken' < IE

*lei- 'soft, weak, thin' < Nst. **łejna 'soft, weak':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	0		0	+	0	0	0		+	+	+	liběvъ
+	0		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	+	liněti
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	0	+	linjati

Illič-Svityč explains the regular development of the IE forms from Nostratic as **-jn- > *-ń- > *-i-. The resulting IE root in CVR was highly prone to suffixation, hence the disparate Slavic roots.

Illič-Svityč 1976:26-7; Pokorny 661-2; Trubačev 15:70-5, 15:108-10; Vasmer 2:492, 2:499.

[62] Slavic *lomiti, *lomъ 'break' < IE *lem- 'break; weak' < Nst. **l´ama 'knead, mash, soften': (Onomatopoetic).

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:21-2; Pokorny 674; Vasmer 2:516.

[63] Slavic *lošь 'bad' < IE *les- 'weak, destroyed, bad' < Nst. **lAsʌ 'rub, damage':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:16-7; Pokorny 680; Vasmer 2:526.

[64] Slavic *lupiti 'peel, bark', *lubъ 'bark, bast', *lepenь 'leaf, a piece of something' < IE *leup-/*leub-/ *lep- 'peel; peeled bark, leaf' < ?Nst. **Lop̣ʌ 'peeled bark (rind), thin layer of plant material':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	leup-
0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	leub-
0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	lep-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+	lupiti
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+	lubъ
+	0		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	lepenь

Trubačev supports Illič-Svityč's classification of Slavic *lepenь with IE *lep- 'peel, bark' and declares the confusion with Slavic *lapa 'paw, hand' (see), especially in such etymons as 'leaf', a secondary development.

Illič-Svityč 1976:33-4; Pokorny 678, 690-1; Trubačev 14:119-21; Vasmer 2:483, 2:526, 2:534.

[65] Slavic: Russian luzda 'skin, scales', lusta 'peel, skin, rind, scale' < IE *leus- 'weak' < Nst. **Lawša 'weak, limp, not tight':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	luzga lusta
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	luska

Illič-Svityč could have cited Russian luska 'scales, skin, peel' or luspa 'scales, skin, peel'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:31-2; Pokorny 682; Vasmer 2:530, 2:535.

[66] Slavic *lьjǫ (*liti) 'pour' < IE *leiH- 'pour' > Nst. **L/ä/jʌ 'water, pour':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	?	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	?	?	0	+	+	+	+	?	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

In the meaning of 'pour' Trubačev accepts only the Baltic parallels to Slavic. He reconstructs a proto-meaning 'pour out, cause to flow' and contrasts it to IE *pel- 'pour, fill' (> Slavic *p̣l-n-), which he ultimately derives from IE *lei- 'release, allow'. The Nostratic languages, on the other hand, point to an original meaning of 'water', traces of which can be seen in OIr. ler-, Welsh llyr 'sea'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:32-3; Pokorny 664-5; Trubačev 15:157-9; Vasmer 2:504.

[67] Slavic *l'ubъ 'dear', *l'ubiti 'love' < IE *leubh- 'desire' < Nst. **Lubʌ 'to thirst':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Vasmer considers Slavic *l'ubiti derived from *l'ubъ, whereas Illič-Svityč and Trubačev treat the verb as an archaic inheritance from IE. In this regard Trubačev notes that here the -i-ti suffix is not causative.

Illič-Svityč 1976:34; Pokorny 683-4; Trubačev 15:174-6; 15:181-2, 15:185-6; Vasmer 2:544-5.

[68] Slavic *majati 'wave', *-maniti 'lure' < IE *meH(i)- 'rock, shake; wave, nod'; (fig.) 'lure, summon, show' < Nst. **maHj/e/ 'rock, wave':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	?	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	0	0	+		0	+	+	majati
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	maxati
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+	man-, mam-

Illič-Svityč copiously documents the Slavic semantic development 'wave' > 'give sign' > 'lure', which leads him to reject a number of cognates (OI, Irn, Grk) offered by Vasmer. He also notes a similar polysemy in Baltic.

Illič-Svityč 1984:35-48; Vasmer 2:569, 2:584, 2:587.

[69] Slavic *māje- 'to tire, torment, burden' < IE *meHi- (> *mā(i) or *mō(i)-) 'to tire' < Nst. **maHjʌ- 'lose strength, weaken; disappear, perish':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	0	+

Illič-Svityč is more restrictive than Vasmer, rejecting Grk. mōlos 'struggle, fight' and Lat. molestus 'burdensome, difficult'.

Illič-Svityč 1984:48-52; Pokorny 746; Vasmer 2:587.

[70] Slavic *marati 'smear, make dirty' < IE *mer- 'dirty, dark' < Nst. **mArʌ 'spot, dirty':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	+		0	+	0

Illič-Svityč reconstructs *mer- for IE, although all forms show o-vocalism.

Illič-Svityč 1976:52; Pokorny 734; Vasmer 2:572, 2:573, 2:576.

[71] Slavic *meljǫ (*melti) 'break, grind' < IE *mel- 'smash, grind' < Nst. **moLʌ 'smash':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
?	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:69-70; Pokorny 716-7; Vasmer 2:597.

[72] Slavic *melzivo 'colostrum', *mъlzǫ (*mlěsti) 'to milk' < ?IE *melǵ- 'to milk' < ?Nst. **mälgi 'breast, udder':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:57-8; Pokorny 722-3; Vasmer 2:644.

[73] Slavic *mene 'me' < IE *me- 'me' < Nst. **mi, 1st ps. sg. pers. pronoun 'I' (oblique **mi-nʌ):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Originally IE *me was the direct case form of 1st. ps. sg. pers. prn. (cf. oblique stem *me-n-). The IE innovation *HeĝHom '1st. ps. sg. pers. prn. ('I')' caused *me- to be reinterpreted as an oblique form.

Illič-Svityč 1976:63-6; Pokorny 702; Vasmer 2:599.

[74] Slavic *męso 'meat' < IE *(H)mēms- 'meat' < Nst. **Homsa 'meat':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:252-3; Pokorny 725; Vasmer 3:30-1.

[75] Slavic: SCr. izmoliti 'step on, protrude, appear', Slov. molę́ti 'protrude' < IE *mel- 'mountain, elevation' < Nst. **mALʌ 'mountain':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	0

The o-vocalism in Slavic suggests the possibility of an IE nominal formation.

Illič-Svityč 1976:51; Pokorny 721-2.

[76] Slavic *morje 'sea' < IE *mor- 'swamp, reservoir' < Nst. **mär̀ä 'moisture, damp':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Vasmer connects this with OI. maryā́dā 'shore', which is rejected by Illič-Svityč.

Illič-Svityč 1976:60-1; Pokorny 748; Vasmer 2:654-5.

[77] Slavic *motylь 'moth' < IE *mot- 'worm, insect larva' < ?Nst. **mʌṭʌ 'worm':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	0

Vasmer cites no IE cognates. Instead he suggests a pure Slavic innovation from either *mesti 'sweep' (cf. Russian mestis' 'rush back and forth') or *motati 'to wind'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:77; Pokorny 700; Vasmer 2:665.

[78] Slavic *mǫžь 'man, husband' < IE *m/o/n- 'man' < Nst. **mänʌ 'man, male':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:58-9; Pokorny 700; Trubačev 1959:96-9; Vasmer 2:670-1.

[79] Slavic: Serbian mrva 'crumb', OBlg iz-mrъmъrati 'root out', ORus -moromradi 'gnaw, nibble, to crumble' < IE *mer- 'smash, grind, crumble' < Nst. **murʌ 'break, smash':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:75-6; Pokorny 735-7.

[80] Slavic *my 'we' < IE *me-s 'we' < Nst. **mä 1st ps. plural (inclusive) personal pronoun 'we and you':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Armenian, Baltic, and Slavic are the only IE languages to retain the archaic pronominal character.

Illič-Svityč 1976:52-6; Pokorny 1114; Vasmer 3:23.

[81] Slavic *mūd-sl-i (> myslь) 'thought' < IE *meudh- 'think, say' < ?Nst. **mUdʌ 'think':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:76-7; Pokorny 743; Vasmer 3:25.

[82] Slavic *myǫ (*myti) 'wash' < IE *meu- 'moist, moisten' < Nst. **mEwʌ 'water, moisture':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:62-3; Pokorny 741-2; Vasmer 3:26.

[83] Slavic *mьnǫ (*męti) 'crumple, knead' < IE *men- 'trample, step on, crumple' < ?Nst. **mene 'step':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:61; Pokorny 726; Vasmer 2:634.

[84] Slavic *mьnǫ *(mьněti) 'think, have in mind' < IE *men- 'think, recall, mention' < Nst. **manu 'think':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+	mьnjǫ
0	0		+	+	0	0	0		0	+	0	měniti

Illič-Svityč 1976:42-3; Pokorny 726-8; Vasmer 2:633.

[85] Slavic *mьrǫ (*merti) 'die' < IE *mer- 'die' < Nst. **m/ä/rʌ 'be ill, die':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:59-60; Pokorny 735; Vasmer 2:602.

[86] Slavic *mъnogъ 'much, many' < IE *mengh-/*menegh- 'abundant, numerous' < Nst. **manga 'strong':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:41-2; Pokorny 739; Vasmer 2:633-4.

[87] Slavic *ŋ̥men- (> *jьmen-) 'name' < IE *nōm- 'name' < Nst. **nimi 'name':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev suggests two groups of IE forms, one of which developed from *en-men- (*en- 'in') and the other from *ano-men- (*ano- 'up').

Illič-Svityč 1976:82-3; Pokorny 321; Trubačev 8:227-8; Vasmer 2:129-30.

[88] Slavic *norvъ 'custom, habit' < IE *ner- 'man, male, male strength' < Nst. **NajRʌ 'man, male':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		0	+	0

The semantic shifts in Slavic ('custom, habit' < 'desire' < 'male strength') are difficult to accept.

Illič-Svityč 1976:92-3; Pokorny 765; Vasmer 3:84.

[89] Slavic *nynai 'now' < IE *nuH- 'now' < Nst. **Nüqʌ 'now':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		0	0	+

Interestingly, this is the only adverb in the Nostratic corpus.

Illič-Svityč 1976:97; Pokorny 770; Vasmer 3:82, 3:91.

[90] Slavic *nьz-i-ti 'pierce' < IE *neiǵh- 'stab, pierce' < Nst. **NEgʌ 'stab':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	?	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		+	0	0	0	+		+	+	+

Slavic *nozios (Rus. nož 'knife', zanoza 'sliver') are secondary, but present throughout Slavic.

Illič-Svityč 1976:96-7; Pokorny 760; Vasmer 3:73, 3:80.

[91] Slavic *ognь 'fire', *ǫg(ъ)lь 'coal' < IE *Heng- 'burn' (*Hŋ̥g-n-i- 'fire' etc.) < Nst. **Henka 'to burn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	+	?	0	+	+	0	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

There exists some controversy over the IE proto-form. On the one hand Illič-Svityč and Toporov claim OLit. ungnis is NOT a typo and reconstruct IE *Hŋ̥g-n-i-. Vasmer, Fraenkel, Pokorny disagree. The former are supported by Nostratic data and such forms as Slavic *ǫglь 'coal', OI aŋgāras 'coal'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:245-6; Pokorny 293, 779; Vasmer 3:118-9; Fraenkel 1158; Toporov 1:87.

[92] Slavic *ok- 'eye' < IE *Hekw-/*Heuk- 'eye, see' < Nst. **Huḳa 'eye, see':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:255-6; Pokorny 775-6; Vasmer 3:128-9.

[93] Slavic *olkati 'lick' < IE *lak- 'lick, lap' < Nst. **laḳʌ 'lick'; (Onomatopoetic).

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč chose not to include Grk. laptō 'lick, slurp'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:15; Pokorny 653; Vasmer 2:514.

[94] Slavic *olnī (< *olnei) 'at another time' < ?IE. *Hel- 'on the other side' < Nst. **ʕal´ʌ 'cross (a mountain)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč #137; Pokorny 24-6; Vasmer 2:516.

[95] Slavic *onъ (demonstrative pronoun 'that') <

[a] IE *Ha-n- (demonstrative particle) < Nst. **ʔa (demonstrative pronoun 'that'):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv	
+	+	+	+	?	+	ʔa

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	Ha-n-

For IE Illič-Svityč reconstructs *he-n-, but in fact all IE languages show -a-.

[b] IE *ne-/*no- (demonstrative pronoun 'that') < Nst. **NA (demonstrative pronoun 'that'):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	onъ

Illič-Svityč 1971:257-8, 1976:93-4; Pokorny 37-8, 319-320; Vasmer 3:140-1.

[96] Slavic *-oriti 'destroy' < IE *Her- 'collapse' <

Nst. **Herä 'to collapse':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	?	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		+	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:246-7; Pokorny 332-5; Vasmer 3:152-3, 3:435; Machek 1949:17:132.

[97] Slavic *ork-yta 'brittle willow' < IE *Herkw- 'bent, flexible' < ?Nst. **9arḳw 'bend':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Precisely which IE forms are to be compared is under dispute. Pokorny offers many forms which Vasmer and Illič-Svityč reject. Illič-Svityč includes Lat. arcus 'bow; arch, rainbow' and Gmc. *arhwō 'arrow' which are rejected by Vasmer. Illič-Svityč and Vasmer also disagree with regard to which Greek forms are cognate.

Illič-Svityč 1971:240; Pokorny 67; Vasmer 3:438-9.

[98] Slavic *ostrъ 'sharp', *kamy 'rock' < IE *Hek- 'sharp edge, point, spike' < Nst. **Hoḳi 'point, spike':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:251-2; Pokorny 18-22; Trubačev 9:137-140; Vasmer 2:173-4; 3:166.

[99] Slavic *ozditi 'to dry malt' < IE *Hes- 'hearth, dry' < Nst. **?aSa 'fire':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	0		+	+	0	0	0		0	+	0

Illič-Svityč 1971:262-3; Pokorny 68-9.

[100] Slavic *ǫxati 'smell', *onia 'stench' < IE *HenH- 'breathe' < Nst. **?anqʌ 'breathe' (Onomatopoetic):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:261; Pokorny 38-9; Vasmer 1:349, 4:178.

[101] Slavic *padǫ (*pasti) 'fall' < IE *ped- 'fall' < Nst. **pạdʌ 'fall':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	?	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč rejects the opinion of Vasmer and Pokorny, who claim this is related to IE *ped- 'foot'.

Illič-Svityč 1984:84-9; Pokorny 791; Vasmer 3:184.

[102] Slavic *pasǫ (*pasti) 'shepherd' < IE *pō-/*pī- (<

*pōi- < *pe/H/i-) 'to shepherd, defend, protect, take care of' < Nst. **/p̣/eHńa 'to shepherd, defend, take care of':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1984:106-111; Pokorny 839; Vasmer 3:215-6.

[103] Slavic *po-čiti, *po-koj 'rest' < IE *kuei(H)- 'rest' < Nst. **Ḳoja 'to rest':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:357-8; Pokorny 638; Vasmer 3:305, 3:347.

[104] Slavic *polxъ 'fear' < IE *pelH-/*pleH- 'shake, fear' < Nst. **pelHi 'shake, fear':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Germanic and Slavic show similar semantic development 'shake' > 'fear'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:98-9; Pokorny 801; Vasmer 3:317-8.

[105] Slavic *porjǫ́ (*porti) 'tear' < IE *(s)per- 'tear, break' < Nst. **p̣äŕ/a/ 'tear, break, split': (Onomatopoetic).

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1976:100-1; Pokorny 992; Vasmer 3:332.

[106] Slavic *prositi 'ask' < IE *prek̀- 'ask' < Nst. **p̣irḳʌ 'ask':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1984:111-125; Pokorny 821-2; Vasmer 3.377-8.

[107] Slavic *puxъ 'down, fluff, fuzz' < IE *pus-, *pous- '(body) hair', down' < Nst. **/p/unčE 'body hair':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		0	+	+

Vasmer's and Pokorny's attempt to connect this etymon with onomatopoetic *puxъ 'breathing, steam, smell' was rejected by Illič-Svityč.

Illič-Svityč 1984:80-1; Pokorny 849; Vasmer 3:414.

[108] Slavic *pьrstъ 'finger' < ?IE *per-, *perst- 'finger' < Nst. **p/a/r/ä/ 'nail':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	+	0	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč rejects a number of parallels cited by Vasmer on prosodic grounds.

Illič-Svityč 1984:70-7; Illič-Svityč 1979:111-2; Vasmer 3:244.

[109] Slavic *pьxati 'crush' < IE *peis- 'smash, crush, press' < Nst. **biç̌ʌ 'to break':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:179; Pokorny 796; Vasmer 3:269, 3:417.

[110] Slavic *rysь 'lynx' < IE *luḱ-/*lunḱ- 'lynx' < Nst. **Luķʌ 'small carnivore':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč's etymology is one of two possible given by Vasmer.

Illič-Svityč 1976:34-5; Pokorny 690; Vasmer 3:530-1.

[111] Slavic *sernъ 'ice crust' < IE *ḱer- (in

derivations) 'hoarfrost, crust (of ice on snow), ice' < Nst. **Ķirʌ 'hoarfrost':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	+	0

Illič-Svityč rejects Pokorny's attempt to associate 'ice (crust)' with 'grey'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:353-4; Pokorny 573-4; Vasmer 3:608.

[112] Slavic *sijati 'shine', *senь 'shadow' < IE *sḱeih- 'glimmer, shine weakly; shadow' < Nst. **çäjḫa 'glimmer, twinkle':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	+	sijati
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	senь

Illič-Svityč 1971:199; Pokorny 917-8; Vasmer 3:602,629.

[113] Slavic *skala 'cliff' < IE *(s)kel- 'split' < Nst. **calu 'split, cut':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč chose not to cite Slv. *kolti 'poke, prick', which is widely accepted as related to *skal-.

Illič-Svityč 1971:195-7; Pokorny 545-6,923-6; Trubačev 10:154-6; Vasmer 3:630-1.

[114] Slavic *skep- 'chop' < IE *skep- 'split' < Nst. **ćapa 'beat, chop':
(Onomatopoetic)

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		0	0	+	ščep-
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	+	+	skop-
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		+	0	+	scěpati

Illič-Svityč limits Slavic data to ChSl skopiti 'castrate' and Russ. ščepat' 'splinter, chop'. Vasmer includes in this nest Slavic *scěpati (> Russ skepati 'splinter, chop').

Illič-Svityč 1971:201; Pokorny 930-3; Vasmer 3:638, 3:650, 4:502-3.

[115] Slavic *skora 'crust, skin, hide, pelt' < IE *sker- '(ice) crust, scab' < Nst. **Ćarʌ 'hardened crust':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+

Slavic *kora 'crust, bark, cortex' has its own IE cognates and their relationship to *skora is questionable.

Illič-Svityč 1971:205; Pokorny 933; Trubačev 11:44-5; Vasmer 2:321, 3:650, 4:451.

[116] Slavic *solna 'hoar-frost' < IE *ḱel- 'hot; cold' < Nst. **Ḳajla 'hot, burn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč agrees with Pokorny in reconstructing a proto-meaning 'burning hot or cold'. Vasmer compares only those IE forms showing 'cold'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:332-3; Pokorny 551-2; Vasmer 3:666.

[117] Slavic *stergti (*stergǫ) 'guard, watch over' < IE *ster-g-, *ster-k- 'guard, love' < Nst. **ç̌irʌ 'look after, guard':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		0	+	0

Illič-Svityč does not include the Baltic data offered by Vasmer (Lith. sergėti 'guard'), a comparison which, according to Fraenkel, causes difficulties.

Illič-Svityč 1971:210-1; Pokorny 1032; Vasmer 3:757; Fraenkel 776-7.

[118] Slavic *stьlati 'spread out' < IE *stelH- 'wide, spread out' < Nst. **ČalHa 'wide':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		0	+	+	stьlati
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+	po-stelь

A problem arises in Slavic when trying to decontaminate forms from IE *stel- 'place' from those originating in *stelH- 'wide'. Thus, it has long been argued whether *stolъ belongs to *stojati or *stьlati. In any event, Vasmer and Pokorny attempt to show a connection with Grk. forms stellō 'fix, send' and to Latvian slāt, slāju 'lay on (in), pack'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:212; Pokorny 1018-9; Vasmer 3:753-4, 3:764-5.

[119] Slavic *stьrvь (or *stьrva) 'carrion' < IE *(s)ter- 'slush, pus, faeces' < Nst. **čiru 'pus, slush':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	0	0	+	+		+	+	+

Nostratic data and Slovenian semantics (strv 'pole in haystack', ostrv 'wood for drying sheaves') support those who link this word with such meanings as 'faeces', 'pus', etc., and not with Germ. sterben 'die', Grk. stereós 'immobile', or IE *ster- 'spread out'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:207; Pokorny 1031-2; Vasmer 3:756-7.

[120] Slavic *sujь 'vain, empty' < IE *keiu-/*ḱieu- (> *ḱeu-) < Nst. **ḳajwʌ 'dig':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	ḱeu-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	0	+	sujь

Illič-Svityč cites a number of IE forms which Vasmer leaves unmentioned.

Illič-Svityč 1971:333-4; Pokorny 521, 592-3; Vasmer 3:797.

[121] Slavic *sьrdьko 'heart' < IE *ḱerd- (< *ḱerdh-) 'heart' < Nst. **ḳErdʌ 'breast, heart':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Gamkrelidze-Ivanov consider this a borrowing from IE into Kartvelian (IE *kert'- > Kartvelian *m-ḳerd- 'chest'). Their interpretation is unacceptable because it fails to take into consideration the AA data (Cushitic *k'Vrd- 'heart') and it ignores the fact that body parts are stable and rarely subject to borrowing. Moreover, it fails to explain why Kartvelian would interpret IE k as ḳ or the purported IE t' as d when it had plain voiced and glottalics at its disposal.

Illič-Svityč 1971:324-5; Pokorny 579-580; Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1984:878; Vasmer 3:605-6; Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1986:365ff.

[122] Slavic *sьrna 'chamois, wild goat' (< 'horned wild animal') < IE *ḱer- 'horn; head, top, summit' < Nst. **ḳErʌ 'horn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:350-1; Vasmer 3:609.

[123] Slavic *tepǫ (*teti) 'beat' < IE *tep- 'beat, crush' < Nst. **ţapḫa 'beat':
Onomatopoetic.

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč rejects Vasmer's and Fraenkel's comparison with Baltic forms, e.g., Lit. tepti 'smear, soil', tapyti 'mould, form'.

Illič-Svityč 1976:108-9; Pokorny 1056; Vasmer 4:44-5; Fraenkel 1081.

[124] Slavic *velijь, velikъ, velьма 'great, big, very' < IE *uel- 'big' < Nst. **wola 'big':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč's IE comparisons assume a semantic evolution 'big' > 'crowd' > 'to press'. Slavic and Tocharian retain archaic semantics.

Illič-Svityč 1976:109-10; Pokorny 1138; Vasmer 1:288-9.

[125] Slavic *xvoja 'thorn, needle' < IE *skuei(H)- 'thorn' < Nst. **cujḫa 'thorn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:197-8; Pokorny 958; Vasmer 4:233.

[126] Slavic *zemja 'earth' < IE *dhǵhem- 'soil' < Nst. **diqʌ 'soil':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Many IE languages show the semantic innovation 'soil, earth' > 'low'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:220; Pokorny 414-6; Vasmer 2:93.

[127] Slavic *znati 'know' < IE *ǵenH-/*ǵneH- 'know' < Nst. **kENʌ 'know':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Gamkrelidze-Ivanov noted the IE (traditionally *genH-, in their reconstruction *ḳenH-) and Kart. (*gen-) cognates and claimed a borrowing from IE. This must be rejected because of the AA data; moreover, an IE > Kart. borrowing makes no sense given their reconstruction of the IE stops, T Ṭ G: it is unclear why Kart., with a T Ṭ G system of stops would interpret a glottalized k as g when it had a glottalized k at its disposal. See also #121. Trubačev's claim that this is undoubtedly derivitive from IE *ǵen- 'give birth to' is incompatible with the Nostratic reconstruction.

Illič-Svityč 1971:296-7; Pokorny 376-8; Vasmer 2:100-1; Trubačev 1957:90; Gamkrelidze-Ivanov ???

[128] Slavic *zola 'cinders, ashes', *zelenъ 'green', *žoltъ 'yellow', *zoloto 'gold', *gladъkъ 'smooth' < IE *ǵhelH-/*ǵhleH- 'shiny, of light color', *ghleH-dh- 'smooth, shiny' < Nst. **gi/ɨ/ḫu 'smooth and shiny':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	zola
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	zelenъ
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	žoltъ
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	zoloto
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	gladъkъ

Slavic *zola has been related to such forms as Lit. žìlas 'gray', Ltv. zils 'blue', Grk. kholē 'bile', on the one hand, and OHG kolo 'ash' and OI jválati 'it burns', on the other. Russian and Polish show not only 'ashes', but 'leached ashes', which supports the former comparisons. The expansion of the root and semantic diffusion took place on the IE level. Illič-Svityč rejects Alb. dhelpërë 'fox'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:229-30; Pokorny 431-2; Trubačev 6:114-7; Vasmer 1:371, 2:43-4, 2:92, 2:103-4.

[129] Slavic *na-zola (> Russian nazola 'sadness, vexation, disappointment') < IE *ǵH/e/l- 'sickness, loss' < Nst. **gilʌ 'state of sickness, grief':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1971:229; Pokorny 411; Vasmer 2:99.

[130] Slavic *zorja, *zarja 'dawn, dusk' < IE *ǵherH-/*ǵhreH- 'dawn, shine' < Nst. **gE/hr/a 'dawn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Building on Illič-Svityč, we must assume that the other forms of this large nest (vzorъ, zьrěti, zorkij, zrak, etc.) are secondary developments in Slavic, which is supported by the fact that Lithuanian žerė́ti 'shine' is the only other IE language with similar verbal development - clearly a Baltic-Slavic innovation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:228-9; Pokorny 441-2; Vasmer 2:81.

[131] Slavic *zvěrь 'wild beast' < IE *ghuēr- '(wild) beast' < Nst. **gUjRä 'wild (beast)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:237; Pokorny 493; Vasmer 2:87.

[132] Slavic *zъly, gen. *zъlъve < IE *ǵḷōu 'brother's wife' < Nst. **kälU 'female relation':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:295-6; Pokorny 367-8; Trubačev 1959:136-7; Vasmer 2:103.

[133] Slavic *zьrěti 'ripen' < IE *ǵerH- 'old, decrepid' < ?Nst. **kirHʌ 'old':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	ǵerH-
0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	ǵr̥H-no-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		+	+	+	zьrěti
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	zьrno

Illič-Svityč 1971:297-8; Pokorny 390-1; Vasmer 2:95, 2:106.

[134] Slavic *žely- 'round outgrowth' (> 'turtle, lump, tumor'); *golva 'head' < ?IE *ghel- 'round outgrowth, head' < Nst. **gUl ʌ 'round, sphere':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	ghel-
0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	ghel-ōu-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	golva
+	0		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	0	žely
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		0	+	0	želvak

Illič-Svityč considers Slavic forms in 'turtle', 'tumor', 'knot of muscle' to retain the archaic semantics 'round outgrowth'. Trubačev sees Slavic innovation.

Illič-Svityč 1971:238; Trubačev 6:221-2; Vasmer 1:429, 2:41.

[135] Slavic *žena 'woman' < IE *gwen- 'wife, woman' < Nst. **küni 'wife, woman':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

The Nostratic data (AA *k(w)n 'one of many wives, woman' - Alt. *küni 'one of many wives') conflict with Kuryłowicz's reconstruction of IE *gn̥H-, inasmuch as there is no comparative evidence for the laryngeal (and no internal evidence either). On the basis of Nostratic data one would reject the attempts of other etymologists to derive *gwen- from various IE verbs: *ǵen- 'give birth to' and *gwen- 'arrive' (> 'the one who arrives').

Illič-Svityč 1971:306-8; Pokorny 473-4; Trubačev 1959:105-10; Vasmer 2:46.

[136] Slavic *žeravь 'crane' < IE *gerH- 'crane' < Nst. **karʌ/kurʌ 'crane':
(Onomatopoetic)

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:292-3; Pokorny 383-4; Vasmer 2:67-8.

[137] Slavic *živъ 'alive' < IE *gweiH-/*gwieH- 'be healthy, live' < Nst. **kojHa 'fatty, plump, healthy':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:299; Pokorny 167-9; Vasmer 2:51-2.

[138] Slavic *žują 'chew' < IE *ǵieu-/*gieu- 'chew' < Nst. **käjwʌ 'chew':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		?	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:293; Pokorny 400; Vasmer 2:39-40.

[139] Slavic *žrěti 'devour' < IE *gwerH-; (and Slavic *gъrdlo 'throat' < IE *gwr̥-tlo-) < Nst. **gurʌ 'swallow' (Onomatopoetic):

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

All IE forms can be traced to *gw- rather than the expected *gwh-, hence there exists some doubt regarding the IE form.

Illič-Svityč 1971:235-6; Pokorny 474-6; Trubačev 7:204-5; Vasmer 1:441-2, 2:48, 62-3; Toporov 2:348-50.

[140] Slavic *župa 'hole' < IE *geup- 'cavity, hole' < Nst. **gopa 'empty':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	+	?	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	+		+	0	0	0	0		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč supports Vasmer's suggestion that župa 'hole' should be separated from 'region, district'. He chooses not to cite Rus. žopa 'anus', but like Vasmer, includes OCS župište 'grave'.

Illič-Svityč 1971:232-3; Pokorny 395; Vasmer 2:61-2,65-6.

[141] Slavic *žьмǫ (*žęti) 'squeeze' < IE *gem- 'seize, take, squeeze' < Nst. **kamu 'seize, squeeze':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	0	+	+		+	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1971:290-1; Pokorny 368-9; Vasmer 2:36, 2:59.

Slavic Lexical Data from the "Materialy"

[142] Slavic *bodǫ (*bosti) 'pierce, butt' < IE *bhedh-/*bedh- (< *pedh-) < Nst. pedʌ 'pierce':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:357; Pokorny 113-4; Trubačev 2:222-3; Vasmer 1:183.

[143] Slavic *čermuxa, *čermъxa 'Prunus padus' < IE *kerm-/*krem- 'strong smelling plant' < Nst. **qarʌ 'to smell':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Trubačev concurs in interpreting IE *-m- as a word-building element.

Illič-Svityč 1967:354; Pokorny 580-1; Trubačev 4:66-68; Vasmer 4:339.

[144] Slavic *da-mь 'I give' < IE *deH- 'to give' < Nst. **to/H/ʌ 'to give':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967,338; Pokorny 223-6; Trubačev 4:194-5; Vasmer 1:485.

[145] Slavic *degot' 'tar', *žegǫ 'burn' < IE *dhegwh- (<*tegwh-) 'to burn' < Nst. *ţ/o/gʌ 'to burn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	?	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	0	0	degotь
+	+		+	+	0	+	0		+	0	+	žegǫ·

Illič-Svityč 1967:337; Pokorny 240-1; Trubačev 4:204-5; Vasmer 1:493, 2:38.

[146] Slavic *dějati 'say, do', *dě 'say', *děsъkazati 'say' < IE */d/eH- 'tell, say' < Nst. **te/h/ʌ 'tell, say':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	0

See #24.

Illič-Svityč 1967:365; Trubačev 4:229-30; Vasmer 1:489-90; 1:506.

[147] Slavic *děliti 'divide', *dělъ 'part' < IE *del- 'slit, splinter, hew' < Nst. **te/ĺ/ʌ 'split, splinter':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	?	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Baltic forms (Lit. dailýti 'divide') and Slavic *děl- indicate IE *-dail-. It is unclear how Illič-Svityč would account for the IE diphthong from Nostratic -e-.

Illič-Svityč 1967:360; Pokorny 194-196; Trubačev 4:233-4; 5:8-10; Vasmer 1:495-6.

[148] Slavic *derǫ (*dьrati) 'tear', *dьrǫ *derti 'tear' < IE *der(H)- 'tear, burst' < Nst. **ter(H)ʌ 'tear':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	?	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:360; Pokorny 206-9; Trubačev 4:209; 5:218; Vasmer 1:504-5.

[149] Slavic *desiti 'find, meet' < IE *deḱ- 'correspond, be appropriate' < Nst. **ta/ḳ/ʌ 'appropriate':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	?	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		0	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:355; Pokorny 189-190; Trubačev 4:217-8; Vasmer 1:505-6.

[150] Slavic *děverь 'husband's brother' < IE *deHi-uēr 'husband's brother' < Nst. **ta/H/jʌ 'male relative':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:361; Pokorny 179; Trubačev 5:19; Trubačev 1959:133-5; Vasmer 1:491.

[151] Slavic *dobrъ 'good' < IE *dhabh- (< *tabh-) 'fitting' < Nst. **ṭʌbʌ 'fitting':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:355; Pokorny 233-4; Trubačev 5:45-6; Vasmer I:520-1.

[152] Slavic *dъbno 'bottom', *dupa 'hollow, cave' < IE *dheub/p- (<*teubh-) 'deep' < Nst. **ṭubV 'deep':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	?	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	dъbno
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	dupa

Illič-Svityč 1967:336; Pokorny 267-8; Trubačev 5:157-8, 5:174-5; Trubačev 1972:10-12; Toporov 1976:5; Vasmer 1:519, 1:554.

[153] Slavic *dьlь 'length' *dьliti 'lengthen', *dьlgъ 'long' < IE *del(H)- 'long' < Nst. **tel(ḥ)ʌ 'long':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Slavic here is particularly archaic: only IE language to preserve non-suffixed forms (Russian dal'). The subsequent development of this root in Slavic is particularly rich (Slavic *dьliti 'lengthen', *dьlgъ 'long', *dalekъ(jь) 'distant', etc.

Illič-Svityč 1967:339; Pokorny 196-7; Trubačev 4:186-7, 5:208-10; Vasmer 1:524, 1:526.

[154] Slavic *dva 'two' < IE *duuo- 'two' < Nst. **to 'two':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967,338; Pokorny 228-32; Trubačev 5:185-6; Vasmer 1:486.

[155] Slavic *gnida 'nit' < IE *knid-/ghneid(h)- 'nit' < Nst. **ñejʌ 'nit':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

I-S explains the irregular phonetic development in this root as the result of contamination with IE *ghen- 'gnaw'.

Illič-Svityč 1967:336; Pokorny 608, 436-7; Trubačev 6:173-4; Vasmer 1:421.

[156] Slavic *lytati 'be lazy' < IE *(s)leu- 'hang freely, loose' < Nst. **/s/ulʌ 'loose':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	+	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:351; Pokorny 962-963; Vasmer 2:542.

[157] Slavic *lyzǵati 'slide, slip', *lyža 'flat bottom boat' < IE *(s)leuǵ-, *sleuk'-, *sleub- 'slippery' < Nst. **śulʌ 'mucus':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	+	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	lyža
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		0	0	+	lyzgati

Illič-Svityč 1967:365; Pokorny 964; Vasmer 2:540.

[158] Slavic *nitь 'thread', *snovati 'warp (textiles)' < IE *sneH́-, *sneH́u- 'thread, vein, twist' < Nst. **son/H/ʌ 'vein':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	nitь
+	0		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	sъnovati

Illič-Svityč 1967:341; Pokorny 973,977; Vasmer 3:76, 3:699.

[159] Slavic *orvьnь 'even' < IE *reuH- 'wide, expansive' < Nst. **rʌwḫʌ 'wide':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:,373; Pokorny 874; Toporov 1975:111-3; Vasmer 3:489; Puhvel 116-121.

[160] Slavic *pal-/*pol- 'flame, burn' < IE *pelH-/*pleH- 'burn', ?*(s)p(h)el- 'shine, sparkle' < Nst. **p̣al´V 'burn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	paliti
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	+	+	polěno
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	polmen-
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	popelъ

The root is extensively developed in IE and Slavic.

Illič-Svityč 1967:337; Pokorny 805, 987; Vasmer 3:192-3, 3:234, 3:273, 3:308.

[161] Slavic *pariti 'fly, hover', *pereti 'fly, move', *pero 'feather' < IE *(s)per- 'fly, wing', *(s)per(g) 'bird name' < Nst. **p̣arʌ 'fly':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	?	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	pariti
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	pero

The connection of this etymon to Slavic words (porom, prat') with initial semantics of 'move' remains unclear.

Illič-Svityč 1967:346; Pokorny 991; Vasmer 3:207, 3:240, 3:243.

[162] Slavic *pek- 'bake' < IE *peku- 'to fry, boil' < Nst. **p̣äḳʌ burning, hot':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967,337; Pokorny 798; Vasmer 3:227.

[163] Slavic *peljǫ (*pelti) 'weed', *pelev-, *pelv- 'chaff' < IE *(s)p(h)el- 'split, splinter, burst' < Nst. **p̣il`ʌ 'split, splinter':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:360; Pokorny 985-7; Vasmer 3:317.

[164] Slavic *per- (OCS prě), *pro-, *pri- < IE *per- 'front, fore' < Nst. **p̣erʌ 'edge':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	per-
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		+	+	+	pro-
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	pri-

Illič-Svityč 1967,345; Pokorny 810-816; Vasmer 3:236, 3:362, 3:370.

[165] Slavic *pjujǫ (*pjьvati) 'spit' < IE *pt(i)eu- (< *tp(i)eu-) 'spit' < Nst. **ţupʌ 'spit': (Onomatopoetic)

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	+	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:354; Pokorny 999-1000; Vasmer 3:291.

[166] Slavic *podъ 'bottom' < IE *ped- 'foot, leg' < Nst. **p̣atʌ 'foot':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	0	+	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:368; Pokorny 790-2; Vasmer 3:295-6.

[167] Slavic *polje 'field' < IE *pelH- 'wide and flat, spread out' < Nst. **p̣ilʌ 'wide':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Originally polъ meant 'open, wide, expansive' cf. ORus. polъ > polyj.

Illič-Svityč 1967:372; Pokorny 824-5; Vasmer 3:307, 3:320.

[168] Slavic *polъ 'half' < IE *pol- 'half, a side' < Nst. **päɫʌ 'half':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Pokorny's entry reflects a contamination of several roots, for which Nostratic supplies some evidence. For example, **p̣ìlʌ 'split' > IE *(s)p(h)el- 'split off' > Slavic *platiti.

Illič-Svityč 1967:356; Pokorny 986; Vasmer 3:306.

[169] Slavic: OBlg. prǫžiti 'tear' < IE *(s)p(h)er- 'tear up, grind' < Nst. **p̣ur(j)ʌ 'grind':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	?	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	0		0	0	0	0	0		0	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:359; Pokorny 992.

[170] Slavic *puxъ 'smthg. swollen, fluff, sigh, stench', *puxnuti 'blow', *pychati 'blow, smoke, be proud', *pyshnyj 'proud, swollen' < IE *peus- 'blow, swell' < Nst. **p̣ušʌ 'blow':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+	puxъ
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	puxnǫti
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	+	+	pyxati

Illič-Svityč 1967:339; Pokorny 848; Vasmer 3:414, 3:421.

[171] Slavic *pyl(ь) 'dust, foam, heat, flame' < IE *pu(H)- 'blow, swell' < Nst. **p̣uγʌ 'blow':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč cites only Pokorny, where the only Slavic evidence provided is Russian pulja 'bullet, sphere'. Vasmer claims that this is a borrowing from Polish kula.

Illič-Svityč 1967:339; Pokorny 847; Vasmer 3:418.

[172] Slavic: Czech pýř 'glowing embers', ǵřeti 'glow', Serbian upìriti 'inflame' < IE *peHu- 'fire' < Nst. **p̣iγwʌ 'fire':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	0		0	+	0	0	0		+	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1967,352; Pokorny 828.

[173] Slavic *pьnǫ (*pęti) 'pull tight, tighten' < IE *(s)pen- 'weave, pull tight, spin' < Nst. **pu/nj/ʌ 'weave':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	?	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:354; Pokorny 988; Vasmer 3:292.

[174] Slavic *pьrǫ (*perti) 'struggle, argue' < IE *per-g- 'hit, cut' < Nst. *pʌRʌ 'beat, strike':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Slavic *perǫ (*pьrati) 'wash; push, kick' clearly belongs here as well, although the phonetic development is unclear.

Illič-Svityč 1967:330; Pokorny 818-9; Vasmer 3:240-1, 3:355.

[175] Slavic *rekǫ (*rečь) 'speak', rokъ 'fate' < IE *rek- 'arrange, determine' < Nst. **ra/ḳ/ʌ 'build':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:368; Pokorny 863; Vasmer 3:465; 3:496-7.

[176] Slavic *rodъ 'kin' < IE *uerdh- 'feed, raise, grow' < Nst. **wirdʌ 'rear, raise':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev suggests that one could compare the Slavic root with Ht. hardu- 'great grandson' and Arm. ordi 'son' < IE *Hordh- 'tall, grown', in which case one would reconstruct Slavic *ordъ and exclude OI, Irn., and Grk. forms in v-, and include OCS rastъ (< *orstъ < *ord-to-).

Illič-Svityč 1967:335; Pokorny 1167; Trubačev 1957:88; Vasmer 3:445-6, 3:490-1, 3:505.

[177] Slavic *ryǫ (*ryti) 'dig' < IE *reuH- 'dig' < Nst. **rowʌ 'dig':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967,362; Pokorny 868; Vasmer 3:531-2.

[178] Slavic *-pъrt- in *vypъrtъk 'prematurely born child', and *zapъrtъkъ 'unfertilized egg, rotten egg' < IE *per- 'give birth to' < Nst. **perʌ 'give birth to':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:361; Pokorny 818; Vasmer 1:369; 2:79.

[179] Slavic *rogъ 'horn' < IE *ro/g/o- 'horn' < Nst. **rʌkʌ 'horn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:361; Vasmer 3:489.

[180] Slavic *ruxъ 'movement', *rušiti 'move, agitate' < IE *reus- 'move rapidly' < Nst. **ružʌ 'move rapidly':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:330; Pokorny 332; Vasmer 3:524-5.

[181] Slavic *rušiti 'destroy' < IE *reus- 'destroy, break' < Nst. **ru/ć/ʌ 'destroy':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:358; Pokorny 870-1; Vasmer 3:525.

[182] Slavic *serb-, sьrb- sъrb- 'slurp' < IE *serb(h)-/*srebh- 'drink, eat soup' < Nst. **šʌrpʌ 'drink, eat, soup': (Onomatopoetic)

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:354; Pokorny 1001; Vasmer 3:604.

[183] Slavic *sipeti 'speak hoarsely', *svistъ 'whistle' < IE *suei- 'whistle, sound' < Nst. **śojʌ 'sound': (Onomatopoetic)

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+	sipeti
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	+	0	svistъ

Slavic *svistъ 'whistle' shows different suffixation.

Illič-Svityč 1967:342; Pokorny 1040-1; Vasmer 3:580-1, 3:626.

[184] Slavic *slep- 'jump' (> 'waterfall') < IE *sel- 'jump, move' < Nst. **SʌLʌ 'to move':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	+	0	0	0		+	+	+

Only Baltic-Slavic show extension of the root in -p.

Illič-Svityč 1967,339; Pokorny 899; Vasmer 3:715; Fraenkel 760. ???Trubačev 1958:36.

[185] Slavic *slina 'spittle', *slizь 'mucus', *slьza 'tear', *slědъ 'trace, track' < IE *(s)lei-, *sleig-, *sleidh- 'slippery, smooth' < Nst. **silʌ 'slippery':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv	
0	+	0	+	+	0	silʌ

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	slei-
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	sleiǵ-
+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	sleidh-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	slina
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	slьz-

Illič-Svityč 1967:365; Pokorny 964; Vasmer 3:668, 3:671-2.

[186] Slavic *sluxěti 'hear' < IE *ḱleu- 'hear' < Nst. **q/iw/lʌ 'hear':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Other Slavic forms such as *slovo 'word', *slava 'praise, honor', *slyvǫ (*slyti) 'have a reputation' have their own IE cognates, but also are derived from Nostratic **qiwlʌ.

Illič-Svityč 1967:365; Pokorny 605-7; Vasmer 3:664, 3:673, 3:678-9, 3:680.

[187] Slavic *smědъ 'dark, bay colored' < IE *smeH-/*smei- 'smear' < Nst. **/sä/mʌ 'smear (w/ grease, fat)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	?	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		+	+	0	0	0		+	+	0

Illič-Svityč 1967,348; Pokorny 966; Vasmer 3:684.

[188] Slavic *sněgъ 'snow' < IE *sneigwh- 'snow' < Nst. **šingʌ 'snow':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	?	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:366; Pokorny 974; Vasmer 3:697.

[189] Slavic *sokъ 'sap' < IE *s(u)ekuo- 'sap, pitch' < Nst. **[s̀aḳʌ] 'sap':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	0	0	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:366; Pokorny 1044; Vasmer 3:708.

[190] Slavic *spina 'spine' < IE *(s)peHi- 'edge, sharp point' < Nst. **p̣i/H/ʌ 'edge':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv	
0	+	+	+	+	0	p̣iHʌ

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	(s)peHi-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	spina

Illič-Svityč 1967:352-3; Pokorny 981-2; Vasmer 3:735.

[191] Slavic *steg- 'fasten' < IE *ste(n)gh- 'poke, spike (n.)' < Nst. *C/SVNgV 'poke':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	0	0		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1967:335; Pokorny 1014-5; Vasmer 3:751.

[192] Slavic *(pro-)stьrǫ (*sterti) 'extend, spread', *storna 'side', *prostorъ 'expanse' < IE *ster(H)- 'spread, strew' < Nst. **ǯʌrʌ 'spread':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		0	+	0	+	+		+	+	+	(pro-)stьrǫ
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	storna
+	+		0	+	0	0	0		+	+	+	prostorъ

Illič-Svityč 1967:359; Pokorny 1029-30; Vasmer 3:379, 3:768.

[193] Slavic *suti (sъpǫ) 'strew' < IE *suep-/*seup- 'sweep, strew' < Nst **/s/up̣ʌ 'sweep':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	?

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:348; Pokorny 1049; Vasmer 3:812, 3:818.

[194] Slavic *suxъ 'dry' < IE *saus-/*sus- 'dry' < Nst. **šu/š/ʌ 'dry':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:367; Pokorny 880; Vasmer 3:813.

[195] Slavic *sъ-božьje 'property, wealth' < IE *su- 'good' < Nst. **šuwʌ 'good':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1967:371; Pokorny 1037-8; Vasmer 2:84-5.

[196] Slavic *sъsati 'suck' < IE *seu(H) 'fluid, pour' < Nst. **sʌwʌ 'fluid':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	+	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:341; Pokorny 912-913; Vasmer 3:725-6.

[197] Slavic *sъsora 'argue' < IE *s(u)er- 'speak, converse' < Nst. **SUrʌ 'speak':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:337; Pokorny 1049; Vasmer 3:741.

[198] Slavic *synъ 'son' < IE *seu(H)- 'give birth' < Nst. **š/e/wʌ 'give birth':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	?	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:361; Pokorny 913-4; Trubačev 1959:48-54; Vasmer 3:817-8.

[199] Slavic *syt 'satisfied' < IE *seH- 'satisfied, full' < Nst. **ze9ʌ 'to eat':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	?	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:340; Pokorny 876; Vasmer 3:821.

[200] Slavic *šujь 'left' < IE *seuio- 'left' < Nst. z/e/wʌ 'left':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	0	0	0	0		+	+	0

The sporadic distribution is explained by the fact that the word for hand, in particular the left hand, was a taboo word and hence subject to replacement.

Illič-Svityč 1967,346; Pokorny 915; Vasmer 4:484.

[201] Slavic *šyjǫ (šiti) 'sew' < IE *seHi-/*sHei- 'tie, knit', *sHieu- 'sew' < Nst. **śi/H/ʌ 'tie':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit	
+	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	sHieu
+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	seHi-

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		0	0	0	silo
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	0	0	sětь
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	šiti (šyjǫ)

Slavic *setь 'net' and *šidlo 'awl, pine needle' are derivatives.

Illič-Svityč 1967:364; Pokorny 891-2, 912-916; Vasmer 3:614; 3:621-2; 4:443-4.

[202] Slavic *ščьp- 'pinch' < IE *skeip- 'pinch' < Nst. **ʒ̀ip̣ʌ 'pinch':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:373; Vasmer 4:507.

[203] Slavic *tekǫ 'flow' < IE *teku- 'flow, run' < Nst. **ṭʌḳʌ 'pour':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:347; Pokorny 1059-1060; Vasmer 4:37.

[204] Slavic *tep- 'warm' < IE *tep- 'warm (oneself)' < Nst. **ţäpʌ 'warm (oneself)':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	+	0	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967,338; Pokorny 1069-70; Vasmer 4:44, 4:78.

[205] Slavic *tęg- 'pull' < IE *tengh- 'pull' < Nst. ţangʌ 'pull':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:370; Pokorny 1067; Vasmer 4:139-40.

[206] Slavic *tętiva 'bowstring', *teneto 'bowstring' < IE *ten-/*tend- 'pull, stretch' < Nst. **ţanʌ 'pull':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+	tętiva
+	+		0	+	+	0	0		0	+	0	teneto

Illič-Svityč's interpretation precludes the association of Slavic forms with Lit. tempiù 'pull, tighten', Lat. tempus 'time', etc., which is the reconstruction given preference by Vasmer.

Illič-Svityč 1967:370; Pokorny 1065-6; Vasmer 4:42, 4:53.

[207] Slavic topiti 'submerge' < IE *tep- 'smear, dip' < Nst. **ţap̣ʌ 'feel, grope':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	?	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:353; Vasmer 4:78-9.

[208] Slavic *topolь 'poplar' < IE *pel- 'poplar' < Nst. **p̣ulʌ 'poplar':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:369; Vasmer 3:79.

[209] Slavic *tьlkǫ (*telkti) 'push' < IE *telk- 'push' < Nst. **ţʌlḳʌ 'push':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:369; Pokorny 1062; Vasmer 4:73-4.

[210] Slavic *tьlo 'base, bottom' < IE *telH- 'flat, hand, leaf' < Nst. **ţal/H/ʌ 'flat':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	0	+	+		+	+	0

Illič-Svityč 1967:355; Pokorny 1061; Vasmer 4:65.

[211] Slavic *tьma 'darkness' < IE *tem(H)- 'dark' < Nst. **ţumʌ 'dark':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:368; Pokorny 1063-4; Vasmer 4:133-4.

[212] Slavic *tьnǫ (*tęti) 'cut, chop, beat' < IE *ten- 'cut' < Nst. **ţanʌ 'chop, cut':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:352; Fraenkel 1099; Vasmer 4:66.

[213] Slavic *tьrǫ (*terti) 'rub' < IE *ter- 'rub' < Nst. **ţarʌ 'rub':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
.?	+	0	0	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:368; Pokorny 1071-2; Vasmer 4:47-8.

[214] Slavic *uondh-s-o 'moustache' < IE *u̯endh- 'facial growth' < Nst. **w/o/mdV 'facial hair':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		0	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:335; Pokorny 1148; Vasmer 4:169-70.

[215] Slavic: Ukr. valjava, Cz. váleti 'make war', válka 'war' < IE *u̯el- 'wound, bloodshed' < Nst. **welʌ 'do battle':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
0	+		0	+	0	0	0		0	0	0

Illič-Svityč 1967:367; Pokorny 1144.

[216] Slavic *varъ 'heat, hot weather', *variti 'cook' < IE *u̯er- 'burn' < Nst. **warʌ 'burn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	0	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	0	?	0	0	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:341; Pokorny 1166; Vasmer I,273.

[217] Slavic *vedǫ (*vesti) 'lead' < IE *u̯edhV-, *u̯ed- 'lead; bring a wife' < Nst. **wetV 'lead':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	?	0	+	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	0		0	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:333; Pokorny 1115-6; Vasmer 1:284.

[218] Slavic *vetъxъ 'old' < IE *u̯et- 'year, old' < Nst. **w/e/ṭV 'year':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	0	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:337; Pokorny 1175; Vasmer 1:307.

[219] Slavic *vezǫ (*vezti) 'transport' < IE *u̯eǵh- 'carry, transport' < Nst. **wegʌ 'carry':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:351; Pokorny 1118-1120; Vasmer 1:286.

[220] Slavic *voda 'water' < IE *ued- 'water' < Nst. **wetV 'water':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	voda

Many IE languages, including Slavic (*vydra 'otter', vědro 'buckey') show an extension of the root in -r-.

Illič-Svityč 1967:334; Pokorny 78-80; Vasmer 1:283-4, 1:330, 1:367.

[221] Slavic *volga 'fluid, food, soup' < IE *u̯elg-, u̯elk- 'damp, moist' < Nst. **wiłV 'damp, moist':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	0	+	?	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		0	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:333; Pokorny 1145-6; Vasmer 1:340.

[222] Slavic *volja 'will, desire' < IE *uel(H)- 'want, choose' < Nst. wiL/g/ʌ 'desire':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
?	+	?	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč 1967:340; Pokorny 1137; Vasmer 1:347-8.

[223] Slavic *xorna, *xorniti 'protect' > 'hide, conceal' and 'food', 'feed' < IE *ser- 'to protect' < Nst. **šerV 'be awake, keep vigil':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	0	+	+	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Vasmer's objections to comparisons with Lit. šerti 'feed' are unfounded semantically ('feed' is widespread in Slavic, together with 'protect') and phonetically (Slavic o-vocalism could be the result of a deverbative nominal formation, i.e., 'food, that which is hidden, protected').

Illič-Svityč 1967:331; Pokorny 910; Vasmer 4:266.

[224] Slavic *žalь 'grief, mourning', želeti 'grieve' < IE *gwe(H)l- 'torment, die' < Nst. **qo(H)lʌ 'kill':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	+	+	+	0	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg	
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	žalь
+	+		0	+	+	0	0		+	+	+	želeti

The development of IE *gw- < **q- is irregular and would need to be accounted for.

Illič-Svityč 1967:370; Pokorny 470-1; Vasmer 2:34, 2:35.

Slavic Lexical Data with Questionable IE Cognates

[225] Slavic *šček-otъ 'tickle' < Nst. **ćaķʌ 'tickle': Onomatopoetic.

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	?	0	+	?	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	0		0	0	0	0	0		+	0	+

Illič-Svityč 1971:204-5; Vasmer 4:500.

[226] Slavic *da Conjunction < Nst. **daHʌ Intensifying

and conjoining particle.

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	+	0	+	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč rejects Vasmer's attempt to tie this form with the IE demonstrative pronoun personal pronoun *do- or with IE *doH- 'give'. Trubačev agrees with Vasmer in the former comparison, but rejects *doH-.

Illič-Svityč 1971:214-5; Trubačev 4:180-1; Vasmer 1:480.

[227] Slavic *kopyto 'hoof' < IE ḱepH- 'hoof' < Nst. **ķäpä 'paw':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	+	0	0

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Trubačev and Vasmer derive this verb from *kopati 'dig', an etymology Illič-Svityč seems to not reject outright, since his analysis for Slavic is under question. Slavic *kopyto is also troublesome in that one would expect *s-; *k- indicates a possible borrowing from a Kentum language, as Illič-Svityč indicates.

Illič-Svityč 1971:347-8; Pokorny 530; Trubačev 11:35-7; Vasmer 2:320.

[228] Slavic *kortъkъ 'short, small' < Nst. **ķUrʌ 'short':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	0	+	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč notes that most etymologies derive the Slavic form (and Latin curtus 'short', Ir. cert 'small', etc.) from IE *(s)ker- 'cut'. He suggests the possibility that the semantic tie to 'cut off, cut down' could have been secondary.

Illič-Svityč 1971:367-8; Pokorny 938-42; Trubačev 11:101-4; Vasmer 2:336.

[229] Slavic *mǫdo 'testicle' < Nst. muña 'egg':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
0	?	0	+	0	+

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+

Vasmer dismisses the IE comparisons proposed at the time of his writing.

Illič-Svityč 1976: 72-3; Vasmer 2:669-70.

[230] Slavic *merža 'net' < IE *merəgh- 'tie, twist' < Nst. muri 'twist, turn':

A-A	I-E	Krt	Url	Alt	Drv
+	?	0	+	+	+

OIn	Irn	Arm	Grk	Alb	Itc	Clt	Gmc	Blt	Slv	Tch	Hit
0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	?	0	0

Rus	Ukr	-	Pol	Cz.	Slv	UL.	LL.	-	SCr	Slv	Blg
+	+		+	+	+	0	0		+	+	+

Illič-Svityč expresses some doubt with regard to the IE semantics, but in my view this reconstruction is sound.

Illič-Svityč 1976:74-5; Pokorny 733; Vasmer 2:601.

Endnotes to Chapter II

1. For IE, Illič-Svityč reconstructs three series of laryngeals: h^w, h, and h́, corresponding to the three series of velar stops: K^w, K, and Ḱ. Nostratic velars and laryngeals followed by labial vowels (**o, **u, **ü) became labial velars/laryngeals followed by *e in IE; Nostratic velars and laryngeals followed by front vowels (**e, **i, **ä) were palatalized in IE and followed by e; velars/laryngeals followed by **a were left unchanged (e.g., **Ho > IE *h^we, **He > IE *h́e, **Ha > IE *he). Subsequent research [Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1985] has shown this to be true for the velars, but laryngeals preserved the quality of the original vowel. Hence, in all reconstructed forms I have followed Kaiser-Shevoroshkin 1985 and modified Illič-Svityč's "h^w, h, h́" to *H (a weak IE laryngeal either lost or of unknown fate in Hittite) and *X (a strong IE laryngeal preserved in Hittite), and I have preserved the original vocalism. For example, in set #1 I have rendered Illič-Svityč's original reconstruction of "IE *h^wes-" as "IE *Hos-" to show the preservation of *-o-.

2. If he is dealing with isolated data from one language, then he does cite specific forms but does not reconstruct a proto-form for the family.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although Illič-Svityč based his IE reconstructions on the material of Vasmer and Pokorny, he modified many of their etymologies. This is particularly true with regard to Pokorny.

In a few instances he was able to demonstrate the common origin of roots which Pokorny treated as disparate. For example, he saw IE *bhegw- 'run' and IE *bheug- 'flee' (#6 above) as having evolved from the same root; various words for 'swamp', randomly distributed among *bhel- 'shiney, white' and *pel- 'full' (#10 above), needed to be separated from the meanings 'white' and 'full'; the development of *gwes- 'extinguish' and *kwsep 'darkness, night' (#32) is analogous to the common IE development of CVRC (root I) and CRVC (root II); *lep- 'strip, peel' and *leup-/*leub-/*leubh- 'id' (#64) reflect the development of the IE vocalic system and the instability of IE *b; in the pairs *egnis 'fire' and *ong-/*ang- 'coal' (#91), *kaiur-t 'hole' and *ḱeu- 'hollow' (#120), and *kers- 'dark, black' and *ker- 'dark' (#21), the first items show the result of IE suffixation.

In even more cases Illič-Svityč demonstrated that Pokorny had grouped genetically unrelated items into one dictionary entry. Thus, he excludes words in 'son' and

'good, better' from IE *bher- 'take, carry' (#5 above, both of the former have their own Nostratic cognates [Illič-Svityč 1971:175, 1971:194-5]; words in 'swell' from IE *bheuH- 'grow, become, be' (#13); words in 'wide' (IE *stelH-) from *st-el- 'place' (#118); words for 'brown' from *Hel- 'deer' (#28); words for 'down, hair' from words in 'breathing, smell' (#107); etc.

In reading the Nostratic Dictionary, one is struck by the depth of Illič-Svityč's phonological, morphological, and semantic analysis of IE. By comparison, Pokorny's monumental work comes across as so much raw material needing further processing, a "shopping basket" of IE roots. Approximately one half of Pokorny's IE reconstructions appearing in The Nostratic Dictionary were modified in one way or another. At the same time it must be stressed that Illič-Svityč's reconstructions never strike one as baseless attempts to prove a theory or flights of etymological fancy.

In Bird 1982 the distribution of IE lexemes in the daughter languages was subjected to analysis. Bird examined all of Pokorny's 2044 roots to determine the number of times each language was represented and the ratio of cooccurrence between any two IE language groups. In Table I, columns 2 and 3, his analysis of the frequency of occurrence of roots in the various daughter languages has been reproduced, and I have carried out the exact same study for the distribution of IE roots in the Nostratic Dictionary

(volumes 1-3). These results appear in columns 4 and 5. The final column represents the difference between Pokorny's and Illič-Svityč's analysis.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF IE ROOTS BY LANGUAGE GROUP

	PER POKORNY		PER ILLIČ-SVITYČ		
	2044 Possible Entries		210 Poss. Entries		
Language	No.	%	No.	%	Change
Germanic	1377	67.3	141	67.1	- .2
Hellenic	1235	60.4	124	59.0	- 1.4
Baltic	1098	53.7	130	61.9	+ 8.2
Indic	1008	49.3	114	54.3	+ 5.0
Italic	959	46.9	111	52.9	+ 6.0
Slavic	941	46.0	144	68.6	+22.6
Celtic	920	45.0	106	50.5	+ 5.5
Iranian	682	33.3	85	40.5	+ 7.2
Armenian	472	23.1	76	36.2	+13.1
Albanian	325	15.9	48	22.9	+ 7.0
Tocharian	260	12.7	50	23.8	+ 9.1
Hittite	155	7.6	37	17.6	+10.0

For the most part the results are not particularly surprising. According to Dolgopolsky's research into the hierarchy of the stability of lexemes, certain lexemes are more stable than others. If our Nostratic reconstructions involve archaic, relatively stable IE lexemes, then their retention in the various daughter languages should be higher than that of the general IE lexicon. Table I verifies that this indeed is the case, with two exceptions. Germanic and Greek both show a slight decrease in frequency.

This phenomenon can best be understood by looking at the distribution of Germanic and Greek lexemes. In cases of dual occurrences of a root (i.e., when the reconstruction of the IE root is based on the data from only two languages), Greek pairs off with another language 170 times (13% of its total) and Germanic 201 times (15%), and these compare with 65 instances for Slavic (7%), 34 for Armenian (7%), and 3 for Hittite (2%). Although dual occurrences of a root could reflect a Nostratic archaism, it is more likely that such occurrences are innovations. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that the highest number of dual occurrences take place between languages which are assumed to have been in close physical proximity at one time (e.g., 44 cases for Baltic-Germanic, 32 cases for Celtic-Germanic, 25 cases for Indic-Greek, etc).

The other item from Table I requiring further explanation is the spectacular jump in the percentage of IE roots retained in Slavic, which went from the sixth most heavily represented IE group to the first. One is tempted to assume that Illič-Svityč, a Slavicist, simply knew Slavic better and hence found more Slavic cognates. This is not the case.

All of Illič-Svityč's IE reconstructions can be found in Pokorny. Perhaps his interpretation differs, and at times he rejects cognates offered by Pokorny and at times he adds his own. Nevertheless, his IE reconstructions

have as a point of departure Pokorny's etymologies, and he relied heavily on Vasmer for his Slavic data. Moreover, he was not a specialist in Armenian, and it also displays a rather significant jump.

By assuming that Illič-Svityč's work represents the oldest IE lexemes, it stands to reason that those lexemes which are not included in Illič-Svityč, but do appear in Pokorny, reflect words of varying origins. Some are reflexes of Nostratic items which cannot be reconstructed, some are early borrowings from non-IE languages, and some of these lexemes are IE innovations. Thus, one could assume that the relatively high representation of IE roots of Nostratic origin in Slavic and the relatively low representation of IE roots of mixed origin reveals that Slavic played a lesser role in IE lexical innovation. This can be explained by assuming that Slavic broke away from the other IE languages at a relatively early stage, and as a peripheral language retained a relatively high number of archaic features and was less affected by innovation. Armenian, because of its geograhic isolation, also retained a relatively large number of archaisms.

This thesis is supported by a number of Illič-Svityč's etymologies which demonstrate Slavic archaisms (for example, see #5, 13, 17, 30, 45, 54, 80, 134, 153) and by other works in comparative IE linguistics. In particular, Ivanov 1965 demonstrated a number of Anatolian -

Slavic syntactic archaisms.

Within Slavic the distribution of IE roots of Nostratic origin is what one would expect: the better researched languages and those with greater numbers of speakers are represented more heavily: Russian is represented in 96% of the etymologies, Ukrainian in 92%, Polish - 87%, Czech - 91%, Slovak - 75%, Upper Lusatian - 67%, Lower Lusatian - 69%, Serbo-Croatian - 85%, Slovenian - 89%, Bulgarian - 88%.

There are few instances of disagreement between Illič-Svityč and Vasmer (see for examples #10, 66-67, 77, 91, 97, 101, 116, 118, 171). The same cannot be said of Trubačev's etymological dictionary of Common Slavic. Examples of their differing interpretations can be found in sets #2, 4, 5, 9-12, 15-18, 22, 23, 25, 33, 35-37, 41, 46-51, 56, and 66 (and Trubačev's dictionary ends at set #67). In all but one case (#47) Illič-Svityč's reconstruction is the more convincing, thus demonstrating the importance of Nostratics for the study of linguistic pre-history in general, and of IE and the daughter languages in particular.

APPENDIX I

ABBREVIATIONS

Languages and Language Families

AA, A-A	Afro-Asiatic
Alb	Albanian
Alt	Altaic
Arm	Armenian
Blg	Bulgarian
Blt	Baltic
Clt	Celtic
Cz	Czech
Drv	Dravidian
Eg	Egyptian
Gmc	Germanic
Grk	Greek
Hit	Hittite
IE, I-E	Indo-European
Irn	Iranian
Itc	Italic
Krt	Kartvelian
LL	Lower Lusatian
Nst	Nostratic
OIn	Old Indic
P	Proto-
Pol	Polish
Rus	Russian
SCr	Serbo-Croatian
Sem	Semitic
Sln	Slovenian
Slv	Slavic (in IE context)
Slv	Slovak (in Slavic context)
Tch	Tocharian
Ukr	Ukranian
UL	Upper Lusatian
Ural	Uralic

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Journal Abbreviations

AO	Archiv Orientální
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
IF	Indogermanische Forschungen
JIES	Journal of Indo-European Studies
KZ	Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen
UABib	Ural-Altaische Bibliotek
UAJ	Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher
VJa	Voprosy Jazykoznanija
ZfSl	Zeitscrift für Slavistik

Andronov, M. S.

1965 Dravidijskie jazyki. Moscow: Nauka.

Anttila, Raimo

1969 Proto-Indo-European Schwebablaut. Berkeley: U of California P.

1972 An Introduction to Comparative and Historical Linguistics. New York: MacMillan.

Benveniste, Emile

1973 Indo-European Language and Society. Coral Gables, Florida: U of Miami P.

Bernštejn, S. B.

1986 "Neskol'ko slov o nostratičeskoj gipoteze." VJa 3:38-41.

Bird, Norman

1982 The Distribution of Indo-European Root Morphemes: A Checklist for Philologists. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Birnbaum, Henrik

1966 "The Dialects of Common Slavic." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 153-197.

1972 "Indo-European Nominal Formations Submerged in Slavic." The Slavic Word, Dean S. Worth, ed. The Hague: Mouton. 142-168.

1973 "The Original Homeland of the Slavs and the Problem of Early Slavic Linguistic Contacts." JIES 1:407-421.

1975 Common Slavic. Progress and Problems in its Reconstruction. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

1977 Linguistic Reconstruction: Its Potentials and Limitations in New Perspective. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.

Birnbaum, Henrik, and Peter T. Merrill

1983 Recent Advances in the Reconstruction of Common Slavic. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Boisacq, E.

1950 Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Heidelberg.

Bomhard, Allan R.

1984 Toward Proto-Nostratic: A New Approach. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

f.c. "Lexical Parallels Between Proto-Indo-European and

Other Languages." To appear Festschrift for A. J. van Windekens.

Buck, Carl Darling

1949 A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Bulatova, R. V.

1979 "Slavjanskij material v 'Nostratičeskom slovare' V. M. Illič-Svityča." Konferencija: Nostratičeskie jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie. Tezisy dokladov. V. V. Ivanov, et al., eds. Moscow: Nauka.

Burrow, Thomas

1946 "The Body in Dravidian and Uralian." BSOAS 11 [Reprinted in Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics. Chidambaiam, 1968].

Burrow, T., and M. Emeneau

1984 A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford U P.

Bynon, Theodora

1977 Historical Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge U P.

Castrén, M. A.

1930 "Über die Personalaffixe in den altaischen Sprachen." Kleinere Schriften. St. Petersburg.

Catford, J. C.

1977 Fundamental Problems in Phonetics. Bloomington: Indiana U P.

Cincius, V.I.

1949 Sravnitel'naja fonetika tunguso-maňčžurskix jazykov. Leningrad: Nauka.

Čirikba, V. A.

1985 "Baskskij i severokavkazskie jazyki." Drevnjaja Anatolija, B.B. Piotrovskij, et al., eds. Moscow: Nauka. 95-105.

Collinder, B.

1934 Indo-uralisches Sprachgut. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1. Uppsala.

1949 "La parenté linguistique et le calcul des probabilités." Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 13. Uppsala.

1952 "Uralaltaisch." UABib 14:1-126.

1955 Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

1957 A Survey of the Uralic Languages. Uppsala.

1960 Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

1965 An Introduction to the Uralic Languages. Uppsala.

1966 "Distant Linguistic Affinity." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. pp. 199-200. Berkeley: U of California P.

1974 "Indo-Uralisch - oder gar Nostratisch? Vierzig Jahre auf rauhen Pfaden." Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Studien zur Indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert zur 25. Wiederkehr seines Todestages. Innsbruck. 363-75.

1977 Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. Hamburg.

Collinge, N. E.

1985 The Laws of Indo-European. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Crystal, David

1985 A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford.

Cuno, J. G.

1871 Forschungen im Gebiete der alten Völkerunde, I. Die Skythen. Berlin.

Cuny, Albert

1924 Etudes prégrammaticales sur le domaine des langues indo-européennes et chamito-sémitiques. Paris.

1943 Recherches sur le vocalisme, le consonantisme et la formation des racines en "nostratique," encêtre de l'indo-européen et du chamito-sémitique. Paris.

1946 Invitation à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes et des langues chamito-sémitiques. Bordeaux.

deBray, R. G. A.

1980 Guide to the Slavonic Languages. 3rd ed., Parts 1-3. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

D'jakonov, I. M., ed. (=Diakonoff)

1981- Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskix jazykov. Moscow: Nauka.

Diakonoff, I. M., and S. A. Starostin

1986 Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian language. Münichener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft: Beiheft 12, neue Folge. Munich.

Doerfer, Gerhard.

1973 Lautgesetz und Zufall. Betrachtungen zum Omnicomparatismus. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 10. Innsbruck.

Dolgopol'skij, A. B.

1964a "Gipoteza drevnejšego rodstva jazykovyx semej Severnoj Evrazii s verojatnostnoj točki zrenija." VJa 2:53-63. [For English translation see Dolgopolsky 1986].

1964b "Metody rekonstrukcii obščeindoevropejskogo jazyka i vneindoevropejskie sopostavlenija," Problemy sravnitel'noj grammatiki indoevropejskix jazykov. Tezisy dokladov. Moscow: Nauka.

1964c "Gipoteza drevnejšego rodstva jazykov severnoj Evrazii (problemy fonetičeskix sootvetstvij)." VII Meždunarodnyj kongres antropologičeskix i etnografičeskix nauk. Moscow: Congress publications.

1966 "Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskix jazykov - gubnye i dental'nye smyčnye v načal'nom položenii." Jazyki Afriki. Moscow: Nauka.

1967 "V poiskax dalekogo rodstva." Russkaja reč' 6:95-103.

1969 "Nostratičeskie osnovy s sočetaniem šumnyx soglasnyx." Ètimologija 1967. Moscow: Nauka. 296-313.

1971 "Nostratičeskie ètimologii i proisxoždenie glagol'nyx formantov." Ètimologija 1968. Moscow: Nauka. 237-242.

1972a "Kakie jazyki rodstvenny indoevropejskim?" Nauka i čelovečestvo 1971-1972. Moscow: Nauka. 106-119.

1972b "Nostratičeskie korni s sočetaniem lateral'nogo i zvonkogo laringala." Ètimologija 1970. Moscow: Nauka. 356-369.

1973 Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskix jazykov. Moscow: Nauka.

1974 "O nostratičeskoj sisteme affrikat i sibiljantov: korni s fonemoj *ʒ̆." Ètimologija 1972. Moscow: Nauka. 163-175.

Dolgopolsky, Aaron B. (=Dolgopol'skij, A.B.)

1984 "On Personal Pronouns in the Nostratic Languages." Linguistica and Philologica. Gedenkschrift für Björn Collinder. Vienna.

1986 "A Probabilistic Hypothesis Concerning the Oldest Relationships among the Language Families in Northern Eurasia." Typology, Relationship and Time. V.V. Shevoroshkin and T.L. Markey, eds. Ann Arbor: Karoma. 27-50.

Dybo, A.V.

1978 "Nostratičeskaja gipoteza (itogi i problemy)." Izvestija AN SSSR, serija literatury i jazyka, t.35, #5.

1984 Preface to the Nostratic dictionary of Illič-Svityč, Vol.3, fasc.1. [=Illič-Svityč 1984]. 3-11.

Eckert, Rainer

1983 Die Nominalstamme auf -i im Baltischen unter besonderer Berucksichtigung des Slawischen. Berlin.

Emeneau, M. B.

1966 "The Dialects of Old Indo-Aryan." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 123-138.

Ernout, A., and A. Meillet

1951 Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots. I. Paris.

Filin, F. P.

1962 Obrazovanie jazyka vostočnyx slavjan. Moscow: Nauka.

Fraenkel, E.

1962-65 Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

1969 Baltų Kalbos. Jų tarpusavio santykiai ir santykiai su kitomis indoeuropiečių kalbomis. Vilnius: Mintis.

Friedrich, Paul

1970a "Proto-Indo-European Trees." Indo-European and Indo-Europeans. George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald, and Alfred Senn, eds. Philadelphia.

1970b Proto-Indo-European Trees. The Aboreal System of a Prehistoric People. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Gamkrelidze, T.V.

1981 "Language Typology and Language Universals and their Implications for Reconstruction of the Indo-European Stop System." Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns, Yoël Arbeitman and Allan R. Bomhard, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

1987 "South Caucasian (Kartvelian) Languages." The New Encyclopedia Britannica 22:736-738. (Part of the longer article "Languages of the World").

Gamkrelidze, T.V., and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov

1972 "Lingvističeskaja tipologija i rekonstrukcija sistemy indoevropejskix smyčnyx." Konferencija po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropejskix jazykov, Predvaritel'nye materialy (12-14 December 1972). Moscow: Nauka.

1984 Indoevropejskij jazyk i indoevropejcy: Rekonstrukcija i istoriko-tipologičeskij analiz prajazyka i protokul'tury. Tbilisi: U of Tbilisi.

Georgiev, Vladimir I.

1971 Bъlgarski etimologičen rečnik. Vol. 1. A-Z. Sofia.

1979 Bъlgarski etimologičen rečnik. Vol. 2. I-Kr.

Sofia.

1981 Introduction to the History of the Indo-European Languages. Sofia.

Gluhak, A.

1977 "Nostratica." Suvremena Linguistica 15/16:49-56.

Greenberg, Joseph H.

1957 "Genetic Relationship among Languages." Essays in Linguistics. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

1987 Language in the Americas. Stanford: Stanford U P.

Hamp, Eric P.

1966 "The Position of Albanian." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 97-121.

1970 "Lithuanian ugnis, Slavic ognь." Baltic Linguistics. University Park: Pennsylvania State U P. 5-9.

Heilmann, L.

1949 Camito-semitico e indoeuropeo. Teorie e orientamenti. Bologna.

Huld, Martin E.

1984 Basic Albanian Etymologies. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Helimsky, Eugene (=Xelimskij, E.A)

1982 "Keto-Uralica 1." Ketskij sbornik: Antropologija, ètnografija, mifologija, lingvistika. E.A. Alekseenko, et al., ed. Leningrad: Nauka. 238-250.

1984 "Problema granic nostratičeskoj makrosemji jazykov." Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka: Tezisy i doklady konferencii 5:31-48. Moscow: Nauka.

1986 "Trudy V.M. Illič-Svityča i razvitie

nostratičeskix issledovanij za rubežom." Zarubežnaja istoriografija slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki, A.S. Myl'nikov, ed. Moscow: Nauka. 229-282.

Hoenigswald, Henry

1960 Language Change and Linguistic Reconstuction. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Hopper, Paul

1973 "Glottalized and Murmured Occlusives in Indo-European." Glossa 7:141-66.

1977 Indo-European Consonantism and the 'New Look.'" Orbis 26:1:57-72.

Illič-Svityč, V. M.

1963a "Altajskie dental'nye: t,d, ." Voprosy Jazykoznanija 6:37-56.

1963b Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Moscow: Nauka.

1964a "Drevnejšie indoevropejsko-semitskie jazykovye kontankty." Problemy indoevropejskogo jazykoznanija. Moscow: Nauka. 3-11.

1964b "Genezis indoevropejskix rjadov guttural'nyx v svete dannyx vnešnego sravnenija." Problemy sravnitel'noj grammatiki indoevropejskix jazykov. Moscow: Nauka. 22-26.

1965 "Caucasica." Étimologija 1964. Moskva.

1967 "Materialy k sravnitel'nomu slovarju nostratičeskix jazykov." Etimologija 1965. Moscow: Nauka. 321-373.

1968 "Sootvetstvija smyčnyx v nostratičeskix jazykax." Etymologija 1966. Moscow: Nauka. 304-405.

1971 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropejskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-K'). Moscow: Nauka.

1971b "Ličnye mestoimenija mi 'ja' i mä 'my' v nostratičeskom." Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju. Sbornik v čest' šestidesjatiletija professora S. B. Bernštejna. E. B. Češko, et al., eds. Moscow: Nauka.

1976 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropejskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l-ʒ). Moscow: Nauka.

1984 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropejskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (p-q). Moscow: Nauka.

Illich-Svitych, Vladislav Markovich [=Illič-Svityč, V. M.]

1979 Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic [Translation of Illič-Svityč 1963b]. Cambridge, Mass.

Ivanov, Vjačeslav Vs.

1965 Obščeindoevropejskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovye sistemy. Sravnitel'no-tipologičeskie očerki. Moscow: Nauka.

1974 Review of Illič-Svityč 1971. Ètimologija 1972. Moscow: Nauka. 182-184. [Translated in Shevoroshkin-Markey 1986, 51-6].

1979a "Syntactical Archaisms of Old Hittite." Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens. Innsbruch. 74-78.

1979b Review of Illič-Svityč 1976. Ètimologija 1977. Moscow: Nauka. 179-184. [Translated in Shevoroshkin-Markey 1986:57-65].

1980 "Prajazyki kak objekty opisanija." Teoretičeskie osnovy klassifikacii jazykov mira, Moscow: Nauka. 181-207. [Translated in Shevoroshkin-Markey 1986:1-26].

1985 "Ob otnošenii xattskogo jazyka k severozapadnokavkazskim." Drevnjaja Anatolija. B.B. Piotrovskij, et al, eds. Moscow: Nauka. 26-

59.

Jakobson, Roman O.

1957 "Typological Studies and Their Contribution to Historical Comparative Linguistics." Reports for the VIIIth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo. Reprinted in Selected Writings, vol. 1. The Hague: Mouton.

1971 "While Reading Vasmer's Dictionary." Selected Writings 2:620-649. The Hague: Mouton.

Kaiser, M., and V. Shevoroshkin

1985 "On Indo-European Laryngeals and Vowels. I. Laryngeals before Vowels." JIES 13:3/4:377-413.

1986 "Inheritance versus Borrowing in IE, Kartvelian, and Semitic." JIES 14:3/4:365-378.

1987 "On Recent Comparisons Between Language Families: The Case of Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic." General Linguistics, 27:1:34-46.

1988 "Nostratic." Annual Review of Anthropology 17:309-29.

Klimov, G.A.

1964 Ètimologičeskij slovar' kartvel'skix jazykov. Moscow: Nauka.

1986 Vvedenie v kavkazskoe jazykoznanie. Moscow: Nauka.

Korenchy, É.

1975 "On the Nostratic Language Family Hypothesis." Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 77:109-115.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy

1968 Indogermanische Grammatik. Vol. 2. Akzent, Ablaut. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag.

Lindemann, F. O.

1970 Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie. Berlin.

1982 The Triple Representation of Schwa in Greek and Some Related Problems of Indo-European Phonology. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Mallory, J. P.

1989 In Search of the Indo-Europeans. Language, Archaeology, Myth. London: Thames and Hudson.

Mann, Stuart E.

1984-88 An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Meillet, A.

1922 Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes. Paris: Hachette.

1934 Le slave commun. 2me éd., rev. et augm. avec le concours de A. Vaillant. Paris: Champion.

1967 The Indo-European Dialects. Tuscaloosa, Alabama. [Translation of Les Dialects indo-européens, 2nd ed., Paris, 1922].

Melikišvili, G. A.

1965 "Vozniknovenie Xettskogo carstva i problemy drevnejšego naselenija Zakavkaz'ja i Maloj Azii." Vestnik drevnej istorii 1:68.

Menges, K. H.

1960a Morphologische Probleme. I. Zum Genetiv und Accusativ. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1960b "Altajische Kulturwörter im Slavischen." UAJ 33:107-116.

1964 "Altajisch und Dravidisch." Orbis 13:66-103.

1965 "Zu einigen ural-altajisch-toxarischen Wortbeziehungen." Orbis 14:1:126-137.

1968 "The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies." Ural-Altaische Bibliotek 15:1-248.

Meriggi, P.

1927 "Il problema della parentela dell'indeuropeo col semitico." Festschrift Meinhof. n.p.

Möller, Hermann

1907 Semitisch und Indogermanisch. Kopenhagen.

1911 Vergleichendes indogermanisch-semitisches Wörterbuch. Reprinted 1970. Göttingen.

Mudrak, O.

1984 "K voprosu o vnešnix svjazjax èskimosskix jazykov." Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka: Tezisy i doklady konferencii,1. Moscow: Nauka. 64-68.

Nikolaev, S. L.

1986 "K istoričeskoj morfonologii grečeskogo glagola, II." Balto-slavjanskie issledovanija 1984. Moscow: Nauka. 157-208.

1988 "Sino-Caucasian Languages in America." Ms.

Nikolaev, S. L., and S. A. Starostin

1984 "Severnokavkazskie jazyki i ix mesto sredi drugix jazykovyx semej Perednej Azii." Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka: Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Moscow: Nauka. 3:26-34.

Paasonen, H.

1907 "Zur Frage von der Urvervandtschaft der finnisch-ugrischen und indoeuropäischen Sprachen." Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen:7:n.p.

Palmaitas, Mykolas L.

1986 "New Contributions to 'Proto-Nostratic.'" (Review of Toward Proto-Nostratic by A. Bomhard). IF 91:305-317.

Pedersen, Holger

1924 Sprogvidenskaben i det nittende Aarhundrede. Kopenhagen. [Tranlated as The Discovery of Language. Linguistic Science in the 19th Century. Bloomington].

Pejros, I.I.

1982 "Drevnjaja vostočnaja i jugo-vostočnaja Azija: sravnitel'no-istoričeskie dannye i ix interpretacija." Drevnejšaja jazykovaja situacija v vostočnoj Azii. Leningrad: Nauka.

Peyros (Pejros), I. A., and S. A. Starostin

1984 "Sino-Tibetan and Austro-Tai." Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages 22:123-7.

Pisani, V.

1972 n.t. Archivio Glottologico Italiano 57:1:n.p.

Pokorny, Julius

1959 Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern-Munich: Francke.

Polák, V.

1955 "Contribution à la grammaire historique des langues Kartvéliennes." AO 23:1-2:n.p.

Polomé, Edgar G.

1966 "The Position of Illyrian and Venetic." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 59-76.

Poppe, N.

1973 "Ein vergleichendes Wörterbuch der nostratischen Sprachen." (Review of Illič-Svityč 1971). Finnisch-Urgische Forschungen 39:365-369.

Porzig, Walter

1964 Členenie indoevropejskoj jazykovoj oblasti. Moscow: Nauka. [Russian translation of Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets. Heidelberg. 1954].

Puhvel, Jaan

1966 "Dialectal Aspects of the Anatolian Branch of Indo-European." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 235-247.

1984 Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 1. Berlin: Mouton.

Račeva, M.

1979 "K ètimologičeskoj problematike rannix zaimstvovanij semitskogo proisxoždenija v slavjanskix jazykax." ZfSl 24:105-14.

Räsänen, M.

1947 "Uralaltaische Forschungen." UAJ 25:19-27.

1955 Uralaltaische Wortforschungen. Helsinki.

1963-65 "Über die uralaltaische Sprachverwandtschaft." Sitzungsberichte der Finniscchen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Helsinki.

Renfrew, Colin

1987 Archeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins. London.

Ruhlen, Merritt

1987a A Guide to the World's Languages, Vol. 1: Classification. Stanford: Stanford U P.

Samuels, M. L.

1972 Linguistic Evolution. Cambridge: Cambridge U P.

Sapir, E.

1921 Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Sauvageot, A.

1930 Recherches sur le vocabulaire des langues ouralo-altaiques. Paris.

Ščerbak, A. M.

1970 Sravnitel'naja fonetika tjurkskix jazykov. Leningrad.

1984 "O nostratičeskix issledovanijax c pozicii tjurkologa." VJa 6:30-42.

Schrader, F. O.

1925 "Dravidisch und Uralisch." Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik 3:81-112.

1935-7 "On the 'Uralian' element in the Dravida and Munda language." BSOAS 8:n.p.

Senn, Alfred

1966 "The Relationships of Baltic and Slavic." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 139-151.

Serebrennikov, B.A.

1982 "Problema dostatočnosti osnovanija v gipotezax kasajuščixsja genetičeskogo rodstva jazykov." Teoretičeskie osnovy kassifikaciji jazykov mira, B.A. Serebrennikov, ed. Moscow: Nauka. 6-63. [A portion was translated in Shevoroshkin 1986:66-79].

Sevortjan, E.V.

1974 Etimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov (Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na glasnye). Moscow: Nauka.

Shevelov, George Y.

1965 A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic. New York.

Shevoroshkin, V.V., and Thomas L. Markey, eds.

1986 Typology, Relationship, and Time: A Collection of Papers on Language Change and Relationship by Soviet Linguists. Ann Arbor.

Sinor, Dennis

1944 "Oural-Altaique-Indo-Européen." T'oung Pao 37:226-244.

1952 "On some Ural-Altaic plural-suffixes." Asia Major 2:203-230.

Sköld, H.

1927 "Indo-uralisch." Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen:18.

Starostin, S.A.

1982 "Praenisejskaja rekonstrukcija i vnešnie svjazi enisejskix jazykov." Ketskij sbornik: Antropologija, ètnografija, mifologija, lingvistika. E.A. Alekseenko, et al., eds. Leningrad: Nauka. 144-238.

1984 "Gipoteza o genetičeskix svjazjax sinotibetskix jazykov s enisejskimi i severnokavkazskimi jazykami." Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka: Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Moscow: Nauka. 4:19-38.

1985 "Kul'turnaja leksika v obščeseverokavkazskom

slovarnom fonde," Drevnjaja Anatolija, B.B. Piotrovskij, et al., eds. Moscow: Nauka. 74-94.

1987 Rekonstrukcija drevnekitajskoj fonologičeskoj sistemy. Moscow: Nauka.

Starostin, S.A., and S.L. Nikolaev

1975 "A List of Proto-Daghestanian and Proto-Nakh-Dagestanian Nominal Roots." With extra-Caucasian comparisons by A. Dolgopolsky. Ms.

1987 "North Caucasian Roots." Ms.

Szemerényi, Oswald J.L.

1970 Einführung in die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft. Darmstadt.

1985 "Recent Developments in Indo-European Linguistics." Transactions of the Philological Society of London 1-71.

Tischler, Johann

1982 Hethitisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 39. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Toporov, V.N.

1963 "K ètimologii slav. myslь." Ètimologija. Moscow: Nauka. 5-13.

1967 "Iz ètimologii enisejskix jazykov." Ètimologija 1965. Moscow: Nauka. 311-320.

1975- Prusskij jazyk. Moscow: Nauka.

Trautmann, R.

1923 Baltisch-Slawisches Wörterbuch. Göttingen.

Trombetti, Alfredo

1905 L'Unità d'Origine del Linguaggio. Bologna.

1908 Saggi di lessicologia generale comparata. 1. I pronomi personali. Bologna.

1916 Saggi di glottologia generale comparata. 2. I numerali. Bologna.

1915-19 Saggi di glottologia generale comparata. 3. Comparazioni lessicali. Bologna.

Trubačev, O. N.

1959 Istorija slavjanskix terminov rodstva i nekotoryx drevnejšix terminov obščestvennogo stroja. Moscow: Nauka.

1966 Remeslennaja terminologija v slavjanskix jazykax. Moscow: Nauka.

1967 "Iz slavjano-iranskix leksičeskix otnošenij." Ètimologija 1965. Moscow: Nauka. 3-81.

1974- Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Moscow: Nauka.

1982 "Jazykoznanie i ètnogenez slavjan. Drevnie slavjane po dannym ètimologii i onomastiki." VJa 4:10-26, 5:3-17.

Tuttle, Edwin H.

1930 Dravidian Developments. Philadelphia.

Van Windekens, A.J.

1976 Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. I. Louvain.

Vasmer, M.

1986 Ètimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka. 2nd ed., vol. 1-4. Moscow: Progress. [Russian translation of Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I-III. Heidelberg. 1953-8.

Vogt, H.

1938 "Arménien et caucasien du Sud." Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap 9:n.p.

Voronin, S.V.

1977 "Deskriptivnye praformy v nostratičeskom sravnitel'nom slovare (t.1) V.M. Illič-Svityča." Konferencija «Nostratičeskie jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie»: Tezisy dokladov. Moscow: Nauka.

Walde, A.

1910 Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Watkins, Calvert

1966 "Italo-Celtic Revisited." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 29-50.

1971 "Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans." Indo-European Roots (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Weintraub, Uriel

1953 Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems. The Hague: Mouton.

Wiklund, K. B.

1906 "Finnisch-Ugrisch und Indogermanisch." Le Monde orientale 1:n.p.

Winter, Werner

1966 "Traces of Early Dialectal Diversity in Old Armenian." Ancient Indo-European Dialects, H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. Berkeley: U of California P. 201-11.

Wyatt, William F.

1970 Indo-European /a/. Philadelphia: U of Philadelphia P.

BBS

Bochumer Beiträge zur Semiotik

Ziele: Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu praktischen und theoretischen Themen der Semiotik.

Erscheinungsweise: Unregelmäßige Abstände, ca. 5 - 10 Bände pro Jahr: Mono- graphien, Aufsatzsammlungen zu festgesetzten Themen, Kolloquiumsakten usw.

Herausgeber: Walter A. Koch (Bochum)

Herausgeberbeirat: Bernard Bichakjian (Nijmegen), Karl Eimermacher (Bochum), Achim Eschbach (Essen), Udo L. Figge (Bochum), Roland Harweg (Bochum), Elmar Holenstein (Bochum), Werner Hüllen (Essen), Frithjof Rodi (Bochum), Klaus Städtke (Bremen) .

Bände: lieferbar (*) und in Vorbereitung (bis Febr. 1990):

***Bd. 1:** HOLENSTEIN, Elmar, *Sprachliche Universalien*. 258 S., pb (paperback) DM 44.80, ISBN 3-88339-419-X (12/85) (vergriffen)

***Bd. 2:** ZHOU, Hengxiang, *Determination und Determinantien: Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel neuhochdeutscher Nominalsyntagmen*. 255 S., pb DM 49.80, ISBN 3-88339-412-2 (3/85).

***Bd. 3:** KOCH, Walter A., *Philosophie der Philologie und Semiotik*. 256 S., illus., pb DM 49.80, ISBN 3-88339-413-0 (1/87).

***Bd. 4:** KOCH, Walter A. (ed.), *For a Semiotics of Emotion*. Ca. 210 S., pb DM 34.80, ISBN 3-88339-415-7 (3.89)

***Bd. 5:** ESCHBACH, Achim (ed.), *Perspektiven des Verstehens*. 155 S., pb DM 34.80, ISBN 3-88339-414-9 (10/86).

***Bd. 6:** CANISIUS, Peter (ed.), *Perspektivität in Sprache und Text*. 242 S., pb DM 34.80, ISBN 3-88339-416-5 (7/87).

***Bd. 7:** EISMANN, Wolfgang, GRZYBEK, Peter (eds.), *Semiotische Studien zum Rätsel*. Ca. 293 S., pb DM 69.80, ISBN 3-88339-417-3 (6/87).

Bd. 8: KOCH, Walter A. (ed.), *Semiotik in den Einzelwissenschaften*. Ca. 600 S., pb ca. DM 94.80, ISBN 3-88339-418-1

***Bd. 9:** SENNHOLZ, Klaus, *Grundzüge der Deixis*. 303 S., pb DM 64.80, ISBN 3-88339-462-9 (10/85).

***Bd. 10:** KOCH, Walter A., *Evolutionäre Kultursemiotik*. 321 S., illus., pb DM 64.80, ISBN 3-88339-463-7 (3/86).

***Bd. 11:** CANISIUS, Peter, *Monolog und Dialog*. 366 S., pb DM 69.80, ISBN 3-88339-464-5 (2/87).

***Bd. 12:** JOB, Ulrike, *Regulative Verben im Französischen: Ein Beitrag zur semantischen Rekonstruktion des internen Lexikons*. 230 S., pb DM 39.80, ISBN 3-88339-487-4 (11/88)

***Bd. 13:** SCHMIDT, Ulrich, *Impersonalia, Diathesen und die deutsche Satzgliedstellung*. 368 S., pb DM 74.80, ISBN 3-88339-494-7 (3/87).